THE

MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. XXXIII.] SEPTEMBER. [Vol. III.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE RICHARD HURD, D. D. BISHOP OF WORCESTER.

[*Continued from p.* 410.]

HOWEVER "distant from promotion's view" Mr. Hurd now appeared, to the observation of his poetical friend, he had scarcely resigned himself, at the age of thirty-five, to pass his life, a simple parish-priest, in the retirement of Thurcaston. The splendid connexions which he had already formed, through the friendship of Warburton, would give rise to other expectations. His attachment to classical studies would also lead him to occupy the intervals of parochial duty in pursuits most favourable to clerical advancement; for he must have seen the stall and the mitre generally bestowed as the reward of literary rather than of theological reputation. The learned author of "The Difficulties and discouragements which attend the study of the scriptures in the way of private judgment," afterwards a prelate, and one of the early friends of Warburton, had pointed out this path to promotion. He advises a young clergyman for whose "success and advancement in the world" he is "greatly concerned" to "take warning from the examples of Clarke and Whiston, and to turn to the study of the heathen historians, poets, orators, and philosophers," as "of greater service than the most useful employment of time upon the scriptures, unless he could resolve to conceal his sentiments, and speak always with the vulgar*."

In 1757, Mr. Hurd published

* "Difficulties and discouragements," &c. "first printed in 1716," republished "from the seventh edition," in "The Pillars of Priestcraft and Orthodoxy shaken," 1768. See vol. iv. pp. 29—35 and 46—51. This ironical censure of the restraints on free enquiry in the Church of England, and which was itself censured by the Convocation, has been always attributed to the learned Dr. Hare, who afterwards made his peace with the church, wrote against Hoadley in the Bangorian controversy, and died Bishop of Chichester in 1740. Whiston thus introduces his name in his "Life of Dr. S. Clarke," 3d. edition, 1791. "Nor has the present Lord Chancellor, [King, the nephew of Locke,] nor Bishop Hoadley, nor Bishop Hare

another edition of his Horace which deserves to be mentioned, as it had the fortune to find a reviewer of no ordinary character. Gibbon, in 1762, then a captain in the militia, amused himself with these volumes in his quarters, and has left remarks upon them among his miscellaneous works, extended over more than twenty quarto pages. Of the commentator he prefixes the following opinion.

Mr. Hurd the supposed author is one of those valuable writers who cannot be read without improvement. To a great fund of well-digested reasoning, he adds a clearness of judgment, and a niceness of penetration, capable of taking things from their first principles, and observing their most minute differences. I know few writers more deserving of the great, though prostituted name of critic; but like many critics, he is better qualified to instruct than to execute. His manner appears to me harsh and affected, and his style clouded with obscure metaphors, and needlessly perplexed with expressions exotic or technical. His excessive praises (not to give them a harsher name) of a certain living critic and divine, disgust the sensible reader, as much as the contempt affected for the same person, by many who are very unqualified to pass a judgment upon him*.

To conclude the account of Mr. Hurd's Horace. In 1766 he published with his name a fourth edition in 3 vols. 12mo. To this is annexed the "Discourse on Poetical Imitation," with the addition of two critical dissertations "on the Idea of Universal Poetry," and "on the Province of the Drama."

Among the first fruits of our author's leisure in his rural parsonage was a work entitled "Moral and Political Dialogues, between divers eminent persons of the past and present age, with critical and explanatory notes, by the editor," which appeared in 1759, and came to a second edition during the following year. The dialogues are prefaced by a conversation between the bookseller and the editor, in which even the licence of literary fiction seems to be exceeded. The bookseller asks if he may "depend on the dialogues being truly original?" He is answered that he "may depend upon it, they are precisely what the editor gives them for." In the preface to the next edition it is observed, that this representation was given not "for any purpose so silly as that of imposing on the public, but for reasons of another kind, which it is not difficult to apprehend." Yet, per-

nor any other of the great advocates for liberty about the court, or in parliament, made the least motion all this while, that I know of, for true Christian liberty; I mean the easing the consciences of those honest clergymen, who groan under the burden of the present impositions in Athanasian creeds, Athanasian forms of prayer and doxologies, and Athanasian and Calvinist articles of faith." Whiston adds in his Memoirs, that Dr. Hare, "finding it rather an hindrance to the preferments he soon afterwards was seeking for, aimed to conceal his being the author (of the "Difficulties," &c.) which yet every body was satisfied he really was." Warburton attempts to shew (D. L. Ded.) that the doctrine of this pamphlet applied only to the "important juncture" when it was published. Let any, if there now are any, who leave the church for conscience sake, or those who remain in it for their families-sake, decide, whether there are not still "difficulties and discouragements which attend the study of the scriptures in the way of private judgment?"

* Gibbon's Miscel. Works, ii. 27. Gibbon in 1770 wrote, on the same side with Jortin, against Warburton's explanation of the 6th Æneid, "Critical Observations", which are highly applauded by the Editor of Tracts, &c.—Gibbon's Life, ii. 136—139.

haps it is not very easy to understand, for the mere purpose of concealing an author's name, the necessity of resorting to the language of literary imposture.

The dialogues in this volume are six in number. The first is "On Sincerity in the Commerce of the World, between Dr. Henry More and Edmund Waller, Esq." The unambitious philosopher here opposes the time-serving politician, whose muse was equally ready, though, according to a well-known anecdote, not equally inspired to sing of Cromwell or of Charles. The second dialogue is "On Retirement, between Mr. Abraham Cowley, and the Rev. Mr. Thomas Spratt," founded on a passage in his life of Cowley, which has since fallen under the acute animadversions of the biographer of the English Poets*. The third and fourth dialogues are "On the golden age of Elizabeth, between the Honourable Robert Digby, Dr. Arbuthnot, and Mr. Addison." The scene is laid amidst "the shattered remains of Kenelworth" the ruined palace "of the great Earl of Leicester." Such objects naturally introduce the political and personal character of Elizabeth, which Arbuthnot is made highly to extol, and Addison to criticize with no small severity. The concluding dialogues are, "on the Constitution of the English Government, between Sir John Maynard, Mr. Somers, and Bishop Burnett." The time supposed is just after the Revolution. The design of these dialogues is evidently to assert the very early traces of freedom in our political institutions.

In pursuance of his plan, Mr. Hurd published in 1762, "Letters on Chivalry and Romance, serving to illustrate some passages in the third dialogue." In these letters to a real or imagined literary friend, the author maintains "that chivalry was no absurd and freakish institution, but the natural and even sober effect of the feudal policy, whose turbulent genius breathed nothing but war, and was fierce and military even in its amusements." Romance he considers as a style of writing formed on "the established modes and ideas of chivalry," from which he describes the Fairy Queen in particular as deriving "its method, as well as the other characters of its composition†."

In 1764 appeared an additional dialogue, "On Foreign Travel, between Lord Shaftesbury and Mr. Locke." This was evidently designed to suggest some improvement in the modes of university education, and to inculcate the inefficacy of foreign travel at an early age.

These separate pieces were brought together in 1765 in 3 vols. 12mo. In this publication, to which Mr. Hurd prefixed his name, instead of the conversation between a bookseller and a supposed editor, there is a preface of some length "On the manner of writing dialogue," in which he displays an intimate acquaintance with the writers in that line of composition.

We have dwelt the longer on this work, because it is said to have procured the author's highest advancement; and from the same work occasion has been taken to

* Johnson's Lives, 8vo ix. p. 16.

† Moral and Political Dial. &c. iii. 202 & 268.

bring a charge against him, which, if substantiated, would affect his moral reputation far more than even his servility to Warburton, for which gratitude to a great benefactor might plead an excuse.

In a respectable publication we are told, that "the king, putting his hand one day upon his dialogues, said, These made Hurd a bishop; and, I never saw him till he came to kiss hands*." Such is the sanction said to be given by the highest authority in the church of England, to the expectation of clerical preferment as the reward of literary, rather than of theological eminence. What young aspiring ecclesiastic, who reads this anecdote, will not be induced to wander over "the Aonian mount," rather than to be a frequent visitant at

——"Sion Hill,
——or Siloa's brook that flow'd
Fast by the oracle of God."

The *charge* against Mr. Hurd, founded on his publication of the dialogues, is the following. The editor of "Tracts," &c. evidently designs for our author the affirmative, while he gives in the form of negation, the following praise to Warburton.

"He never thought it expedient to save appearances by shaking off the 'shackles of consistency;' to soften the hideous aspect of certain uncourtly opinions, by a calm and progressive apostacy; to expiate the artless and animated effusions of his youth, by the example of a temporizing and obsequious old age. He began not his course as others have done with speculative republicanism, nor did he end it, as the same persons are now doing, with practical toryism. He was a churchman without bigotry. He was a politician without duplicity. He was a loyalist without servility†."

In support of the heavy censure of Mr. Hurd, which this passage implies, we are referred to the following note on "uncourtly opinions."

"I am told by one, whom I esteem the best Greek scholar in this kingdom, and to whom the hat of Bentley would have 'vailed,' that many notable discoveries might be made by comparing the *variæ lectiones*, the clippings and the filings, the softenings and the varnishings of sundry constitutional doctrines, as they crept by little and little into the different successive editions of certain political dialogues‡."

Many readers of these passages will be at no loss to conjecture whom the reputed editor of "Tracts," &c. so competent to decide such a question, would "esteem the best Greek scholar in this kingdom." Yet this heavy accusation of political apostacy being anonymous, it had certainly been more equitable to have given satisfactory references to "the *variæ lectiones*," and to have produced at least a few specimens of "the clippings and the filings." For want of these we have carefully compared the second edition, of 1760, not being able to procure the first, with the fifth, of 1776, as to the "Political Dialogues." It will be found, we are persuaded, by any one who makes the same experiment, that the variations are merely verbal, in all but the following instances, which, except

* Gent. Mag. LXXVIII. 562. † Tracts, &c. p. 156. ‡ Ibid.

the last, serve to strengthen rather than to detract from "sundry constitutional doctrines."

In the fifth edition are three notes which were not in the edition of 1760.

1. "Milton did not forget to observe in his *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, that William the Norman, though a conqueror, and not unsworn at his coronation, was compelled a second time to take oath at St. Alban's ere the people would be brought to yield obedience."

2. "It may be of little moment to us, at this day, to inquire how far the princes of the house of Stuart, were blameable for their endeavours to usurp on the constitution. But it must ever be of the highest moment to maintain, that we had a constitution to assert against them. Party writers perpetually confound these two things: it is the author's purpose in these two dialogues to contend for the latter*."

The third note, which is not found in the edition of 1760, is on Hume's history, to account for its political complexion from his "having by some odd chance written the history of the Stuarts first†."

The omissions in the fifth edition are two. The first is a short note on the "Alliance between Church and State," against which some *moderate* divines of the established church, are said to "have taken offence," and "the dissenters to a man." The latter no doubt are intended by "the saints," who "yearn to see the rubbish of human ordinances taken out of the way, and the godly work of reformation pushed on to gospel perfection‡."

The other omission in the fifth edition is a note of considerable length, on Hume's "Apology for the House of Stuart." At the close of the note, "the reader is left to himself to answer that insulting question," proposed by the historian, "*whether it was the people who encroached upon the sovereign, or the sovereign who attempted to usurp on the people*§."

The loss of this passage is much to be regretted, as it contained a high approbation of the patriots who first opposed the rights of the people to the pretensions of Charles. The omission may perhaps be not unfairly attributed to the change, which, soon after the commencement of a new reign, had taken place in the language of the court, respecting "the unhappy Scottish line," so many adherents of that family having now transferred their allegiance. That Mr. Hurd would be duly observant of this change cannot be reasonably doubted. Nor would his growing intimacy with courtiers, especially with Lord Mansfield, render him less indulgent to the memory of the House of Stuart. Yet after all,

The right divine of kings to govern wrong,

and,

The enormous faith of many made for one,

appear to be as uniformly exploded, while the popular origin of just government, and the antiquity of a free constitution in England, are as fully asserted in the fifth edition of the dialogues as in the second, or as any advocate for a limited monarchy can desire. At least we have not been able to make any "notable discoveries" to the contrary.

We are not giving the panegyric of bishop Hurd, nor is it to be

* Mor. and Pol. Dial. 5th Ed. 1776, ii. 122 & 223. † Ibid. ii. 226.
‡ Ibid. 2d Ed. 1760, p. 375. § Ibid. pp. 313—316.

expected in this memoir; but have been led into this detail because charges against him, as a writer, so serious and supposed to stand on such high and respectable literary authorities, could not be fairly passed unexamined. To return to the order of our author's publications.

In 1764, Mr. Hurd found another occasion of shewing his attachment to his great friend, now advanced to the see of Gloucester. Mr. John Wesley, with Mr. Whitfield, had for several years been famous in the religious world. They published journals of their progresses, containing too many extravagant passages, justly censurable, and which could not be overlooked by the more regular clergy. The attack on these extravagances was ably commenced in 1754, by "The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists compared," a work attributed to bishop Lavington. "The bishop of Gloucester," also, as we are told by his biographer, "had watched Mr. John Wesley's motions with care for some years, and now thought himself able to give a fair and full account of them to the public, from the materials in that adventurer's own journals*." Such is the term by which bishop Hurd, when no longer a young man, could allow himself to describe a Christian minister, who had just closed a long, laborious life, and who, whatever were his errors or eccentricities, had probably been as successful as any modern prelate, in "turning many to righteousness."

Bishop Warburton, in pursuance of his design, published in 1762, "The Doctrine of Grace: or, the Office and Operations of the Holy Spirit, vindicated from the insults of Infidelity, and the abuses of Fanaticism." To this work, however neglected at present, immortality is promised by the bishop's fond biographer. For "the singular merit of the composition, it will be read," we are informed, "when the sect that gave occasion to it is forgotten; or rather, the sect will find a sort of immortality in this discourse†!!" In "The Doctrine of Grace," it was asserted, that some of the writers of the New Testament, "had the Greek tongue miraculously infused into them‡." This opinion so consistent with the doctrine of a plenary inspiration of the scriptures, has not, we believe, been generally received among the orthodox. It was controverted by Dr. Thomas Leland, the learned translator of Demosthenes, and biographer of Philip of Macedon, in his "Dissertation on the principles of human eloquence." There presently appeared an anonymous letter to Dr. Leland, in defence of "the bishop of Gloucester's idea of the nature and character of an inspired language." This pamphlet exhibits the same contemptuous spirit§ which the seventh dissertation had displayed nine years before, and is also justly attributed to Mr. Hurd. It was received with equal indifference by the learned person to whom it was addressed,

* Discourses by way of general preface, &c. p. 92. † Ibid.

‡ Warburton's Works, 4to. iv. 573.

§ The following may serve as a specimen in a letter from one scholar to another. "I shall endeavour, with all care, to pick up the loose ends of your argument as I find them any where *come up* in the several chapters of your dissertation." Letters, &c. in "Tracts," &c. p. 239.

being republished by Dr. Leland, when it had become scarce, and with great fairness and magnanimity, placed between his own dissertation and the defence*. This literary offspring became at length, like the 7th dissertation, disgusting to its reputed parent, who is said to have taken pains to suppress it; but the learned editor of "Tracts by Warburton," &c. determined to bestow upon both these ill-starred productions all the immortality which his classical prefaces may be expected to attain, till,

Our sons their fathers' failing language see,
And such as Chaucer is shall Dryden be.

[*To be concluded in our next.*]

[We regret that we are not able to conclude this article of biography in the present number, the whole of the copy not having yet come into our hands.]

ORIGINAL LETTER ON THE INSURRECTION AT MADRID IN 1766.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, *Clapton, Aug.* 5, 1808.

The following letter, which may be peculiarly interesting at the present time, came into my hands with the original letters of Franklin, printed in your first volume, p. 137, 192, 255. This, from the post mark, appears to have been received in the ordinary course, though, evidently for the writer's security, it has no signature. It is plain, however, from Mr. George Whatley's indorsement of the letter, that his correspondent was a friend with whose hand writing he was well acquainted.

Yours, J. T. RUTT.

Madrid, April 7, 1766.

I wrote to you, dear Sir, a short letter on the 31st March, in a very great hurry, and as I kept no copy of it, I may, perhaps, repeat some things over again, but I am willing to acquaint you with all that passed from the beginning to the end of the late insurrection here. I mentioned to you the 17th of March, the edict published against wearing any more at Madrid flapped hats or long cloaks, so that every body appeared here on the 15th March with hats cocked up, and cloaks shorter than before. This gave very great discontent, but as every one conformed thereto, it was generally thought that all people would continue to submit to this new custom. But the Spaniards, so strongly averse to novelties, and so fond of their old favorite dress, could not bear being deprived of it, and some people for their own private ends, worked upon the minds of the common people, and imagined this would be a good pretext for the ruin of the late minister who was so odious to the public.

Emissaries were spread in all parts of the town, and on palm Sunday in the afternoon, several appeared with flapped hats, and towards the evening one passed by a guard of some few soldiers, who, according to the orders given to them, secured in their guard-room the man with the flapped hat, but he was soon rescued by the mob, and soon afterwards the insurrection was general. The Marquis de Squillace dined that day in the country, about two leagues off, and 'tis thought, that the design was to sacrifice him on his return, but he had notice of what passed before he entered the town, and by a large circuit round the walls, he got safe in his coach to the new palace. His lady and children on their return from airing were met by the Dutch envoy, who carried them to his own house, and by great good fortune it was kept a secret. Part of the mob went to Squillace's house and broke the windows, but never offered to break open the gate. About eight o'clock, they returned again to his house, then broke the windows of the Marquis de Grimaldi and two of the principal magistrates, and destroyed every new lamp in the streets, expressing the greatest rage and fury against those very useful ornaments. The Walloon guards fired on the mob, of which some few were killed, as were some of the soldiers: the whole night passed in noise and clamours. Long live the king, and, Die Squillace, were repeated in every street.

* Letters, &c. in "Tracts," &c. p. 145.

On the monday morning thousands of people assembled in the great square, high street, and about the palace, without arms, and committing no manner of violence to any one, and only insisting that all should flap their hats, in which manner all the ambassadors, with their servants, went to court without the least interruption. Thus every thing continued till about four o'clock in the afternoon, (the piety of the catholic king inclining him to employ all acts of clemency rather than rigour,) when the mob sent a paper to his majesty, who was graciously pleased to promise that his subjects should continue with their old Spanish dress, that bread and provisions should be lowered, and a Spaniard should succeed the Marquis de Squillace; and, that same evening before dark these acts of clemency were proclaimed to the people, and Signor Don Miguel de Muzquiz appointed for the department of the Hazienda, whereupon all the people dispersed and every thing was quiet during that night, as if nothing had happened. But as soon as it was known the next morning, Tuesday, that the catholic king, with all the royal family and principal attendants on the court, had gone to Aranjuez before day, a kind of madness seized the common people, who assembled in large parties, seized the arms and drums of the many small guards of soldiers dispersed about the town, and taking by force every offensive weapon or club they could find, and joined by numbers of the lowest sort of women, took possession of every gate of the town, permitting none to go out on foot or in carriages, but giving leave to every one to come in, and bring all kinds of things free of duty or customs: others in large bodies with shouts and noise marched with drums beating, and firing their muskets without balls in the air, terrifying every body, but injuring no one, and thus continued all that day and the following night, with the additional circumstance of their appearing with flambeaus and torches.

They permitted, however, messengers to be dispatched to Aranjuez with letters from the governor of the council. On Wednesday morning 26th March, the same tumults continued, till the arrival of a messenger from Aranjuez, who was conducted by thousands of people, to the governor of the council to whom was delivered a royal dispatch, the contents of which were immediately made known to the public, by proclamations in different parts of the town, whereby his catholic majesty's gracious declarations were published, viz. entire pardon for all past offences, entire liberty for flapped hats and long cloaks, the price of bread to be reduced to eight quarts the loaf, from 12 quarts that it was before the riot, oil and soap quarts 14 for what was worth 17, and bacon or lard to 16. That the Junta de Abastos should be abolished, that the Walloon guards should retire from Madrid, as also the Marquis de Squillace, and that the aforesaid Signor Muzquiz, a Spaniard, should be minister of the Hazienda; all this to be granted upon condition that the people should retire home and to their respective occupations, deliver up their arms, and be no more seen in parties and crowds. These royal acts of grace and clemency had the desired effect; for before noon, of the 26, all the people retired and dispersed, after delivering to every guard the arms and drums they had seized, and shook hands with the soldiers.

I own to you that I was very much alarmed at first. On the Monday morning I went to Lord Rochford's in my coach, my servants with their flapped hats, and I held my own flapped at the window, by which I passed very quietly and returned home that evening with the same tranquillity. On the Tuesday morning I went again to my lord's, and his lordship was desirous I should remain with him all that night, and permitted my small family to remain there, as the situation of his house promised more quiet. I tell you all these facts for your own private information, and I can say no more by common post, nor indeed is it yet easy to see clear into all the secrets of this proceeding. I have in my own particular lost a kind friend in the late minister. I was at his office on the Saturday, the day before the insurrection. "I know," saith he, "you have a great deal to say to me, but I wish you would come after to-morrow, for I must go directly to the King." He added, "we will be often together this year at Aranjuez." How uncertain is our destiny in this world, and what accidents happen from one moment to another. He is gone to some sea-port to embark for Italy, and I believe to Carthagena. The new minister has been 30 years in the finances. I am well known to him, and he knows well how much his predecessor was always partial to me. What will Ough say when he hears this? I am, my dear Sir, most sincerely and truly,

Yours, &c. &c.

George Whatley, Esq.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

MR. STURCH, ON A PASSAGE IN THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S SERMONS, AGAINST NATURAL REASON.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, *London, May* 4, 1808.

The objections of the sceptic to the authority and excellency of the Christian religion, have been often represented, and in many instances, no doubt, justly, as the effect of prejudice. But are there not prejudices in favour of Christianity, or rather against the religion of nature, equally groundless and unreasonable? And do we not sometimes find men of no small note, labouring to defend the cause of supernatural revelation, with arguments as weak and contemptible as any that have ever been advanced against it by the unbeliever?

I am led to this reflection by a very curious passage in the Lectures on the gospel of St. Matthew, by Dr. Porteus, the present bishop of London; in which he hesitates not to assert roundly, that natural reason or philosophy can *never* keep men *honest*, when they have any temptation to the contrary; or in other words, that there can be no virtue at all, except among Christians! After describing the atrocious conduct of Pilate, in the condemnation of Jesus, vol. 2. p. 281—2, he adds—

"Could any thing like this have happened in this country? We all know, that it is *impossible*. We all know, that no dangers, no threats, no fears, either of Cæsar, or of the people, could ever induce a British judge, to condemn to death, a man whom he, in his conscience, believed to be innocent. And what is it that produces this difference between a Roman and a British judge? It is this: that the former had no other principle to govern his conduct but *natural reason*, or what would now be called philosophy; which, though it would *sometimes* point out to him the path of duty, yet could *never* inspire him with fortitude enough to persevere in it in critical and dangerous circumstances; in opposition to the frowns of a tyrant, or the clamours of a multitude. Whereas the British judge, in addition to his natural sentiments of right and wrong, and the dictates of the moral sense, has the principle of *religion* also to influence his heart; he has the unerring and inflexible rules of evangelical rectitude to guide him; he has that which will vanquish every other fear, the fear of God, before his eyes. He knows that he himself must one day stand before the judge of all; and that consideration *keeps him firm to his duty*, be the dangers that surround him ever so formidable and tremendous."

Is the good bishop then prepared to maintain that the heathens had no religion—that though they had some ideas of right and wrong in theory, yet they paid no regard to them in practice—that the Greeks and Romans, when they devised the legal forms of civil and criminal process, had not the public safety in view, or if they had, that this principle was insufficient to teach them that *an innocent man ought not to be hanged*? He knows that they had solemn judicial proceedings, judges, advocates, pleadings, and appeals to heaven by oath; will he then tell us what these things meant, if they were not intended to protect

the innocent and to punish the guilty? It is probably many years since his lordship read Horace; but he can scarcely have forgotten that beautiful character of the upright man, which is in the mouth of every school-boy, and which so pointedly contradicts his false and injurious statement.

Justum et tenacem propositi virum
Non *civium ardor* prava jubentium,
Non *vultus instantis tyranni*
Mente quatit solidâ.

The upright man steadily adheres to his principle; nor suffers his virtuous resolution to be shaken, either by the clamour of a corrupt people, or the frown of a tyrant.

The bishop cannot be ignorant, that Justice and Fortitude are placed among the cardinal virtues, and honoured and celebrated with the most enthusiastic praises by the poets and moralists of antiquity; and can he possibly believe, that these noble qualities were held in such high esteem and universal admiration, and yet, that there were no instances of their existence in real life? Has he in fact, never heard of the name of Socrates, of Aristides, of Pittacus, of Phocion, of Epaminondas, among the Greeks; or of Junius Brutus, of Cato, of Scipio Africanus, of Marcus Aurelius, among the Romans? That justice was sometimes perverted by Heathen magistrates is beyond dispute, but can his lordship be serious when he would have us believe that this is *never* the case in what are called Christian countries? What! has he never heard of bribery and corruption, of unjust judges, civil and ecclesiastical, of time-serving bishops, of servile parliaments, of profligate ministers of state, of debauched, cruel, and tyrannical monarchs among professing Christians? To look no farther than our own country; have the names of Jefferies as a judge, of Bonner as a bishop, and of Henry the eighth as a sovereign, never reached his ears? Or does he really believe that these *worthies* would have been less chaste and temperate, less just and upright, less mild and merciful than they actually were, if they had been so unfortunate as to have had only the *light of nature* to direct them? Was not the last mentioned *great personage*, in whose horrible reign no fewer than seventy-two thousand persons perished by the hand of the executioner, so good a Christian as to have acquired the tittle of *Defender of the Faith* for himself and his successors? Were not those judges, among whom was a lord chancellor and a chief justice, who were his accomplices in the execrable murder of the virtuous Sir Thomas More, all Christians? And those who, to obtain court favour, countenanced Charles the first in his illegal exactions, as well as those who, to please the mob, condemned him to death, were they not all Christians, as much as those who sit in the court of king's bench at this day? Was not Jefferies himself a Christian, of whom the accurate Rapin declares that, "Never man had better deserved a public punishment, as an atonement, for all the mischiefs done to his country, and for all the *blood spilt by his means*?" Surely the bishop cannot have forgotten, that since the reformation from popery, at which period, it is pretended that Christianity was established in England, in its purest and most perfect form, there have been *two instances*, of the *highest law officer*

to the state, having been tried and *found guilty* of the meanest of all crimes, of accepting bribes to pervert justice; and that not once only committed, but many times repeated in each case; and that, in both cases, the guilt was so manifest, that by the unanimous judgment of the house of lords, one of these criminals was fined forty thousand, and the other thirty thousand pounds, and declared for ever incapable of serving the public. Be it remembered, not only that both these noble persons were *believers*, but that one of them was an eminent and boasted champion of Christianity! How happened it then, that their principles did not "keep them firm to their duty;" and what is the true reason why our modern English judges, generally speaking, act more uprightly than their predecessors, or than some of those who lived under the Roman emperors? It is *not*, we see, because they are *Christians*. It is principally because, by a most wise act of parliament, passed in the first year of our glorious revolution, they have been delivered from the fear of Cæsar, and of the people, and have been *placed in a state of independence*. It is not to the establishment of Christianity, but it is to the alterations and improvements in our excellent constitution, for which our forefathers so nobly struggled, that we owe our present comparatively just, mild, and beneficent system of government: and if ever the people of this country should be so false to themselves, and so utterly regardless of the welfare of their posterity, as to surrender their inestimable privileges, they will infallibly experience a renewal of those numerous evils which are the offspring of unlimited authority; among which, notwithstanding all their Christianity, will be tyrannical sovereigns and *venal judges*.

Far be it from me to speak disparagingly of pure unsophisticated Chistianity. What moral effect the general reception of it, in any country, is capable of producing, *has never yet been tried*. From that *corruptio optimi* which passes for Christianity in almost every country of Europe, little good is to be expected. That it does not hinder learned and eloquent divines from preaching and publishing the most childish trash, is abundantly evident. This very passage however upon which I have been remarking, having been written by a popular bishop, has been selected for applause, and pronounced to be *judicious*, by some of our *sagacious* and *impartial* periodical writers.

I am, Sir,
Your sincere friend,
W. STURCH.

JOHN LACY'S PROPHECY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, *Bath, June* 2, 1808.

Paul the apostle asserts that there will be an end of prophecy, but he does not say when. Some Christians (among whom are the Socinians in general) say it has

ended long ago; others are of opinion that it still exists, and appears on very important occasions. There have been some occurrences respecting the dreadful fate of France so accurately foretold a century beforehand, that I myself have no doubt of the spirit of prophecy being still appointed, as a means of convincing man of the divine agency, as much as in the days of Moses, or of the idolatrous kings of Israel.

I am led to these observations at this time by having before me, a book printed in 1708, entitled "Warnings of the Eternal Spirit, by the mouth of his servant John, surnamed Lacy," wherein I read of events so exactly fulfilled, and the horrors of the French revolution so accurately described, that I cannot see how it can be accounted for, but by admiting that the spirit of prophecy has not yet failed.

Louis XIV. was at that time in all his glory, and every Frenchman was proud of the greatness of "le grand monarque:" he had just finished that proud palace of Versailles, (which is here denounced) and adorned it with every splendor that riches, art, and genius could produce; yet this warning of the spirit declares its downfal, that not one of these proud trophies of his fame should remain; likewise the fate of his family, the time when it should happen; and the punishment of some of the cities of France, as the following extract will shew:

"Come forth Monsieur, Monsieur Louis the blasphemer! I come to speak to thee, O great king. Who art thou—poltroon! Who art thou that thou hast boasted thyself after so haughty a manner? against me and against my children? Those poor children whom thou thinkest to have destroyed throughout thy kingdom*. They shall rise up with great splendor, at my appointment.—Wretch! thy subjects shall contemn thy memory†.—Yes, I will expose thee, I will make thee appear a weak worm. Thou art not worthy to walk erect as a man, with thy face towards that heaven, against which thou hast fought. Wretch, thou shalt be cast down‡, for I am the king of kings and not thou. Thy adversary shall torment thee, before thou diest; I will commission him to torment thee in thy conscience; yea, with such horrors, that thy courtiers shall observe it—For I will glorify myself upon thee, and destroy all those images of thyself, which thou hast so proudly set up, and all thy statues§.

"Thy miserable courtiers, who adore thee, more than they do me, *even all the court of France*, I will make them feel their abomination in that kind‖. I will bear with them no longer: yea, that Versailles which thou hast made for the glory of thy name, I will throw it to the ground¶, and all thy insolent inscriptions, thy figures, and thy abominable pictures of thy own glory.

* The revocation of the edict of Nantz was a cruel measure, and banished 50,000 French from their family and country: many were put to death, and many respectable men sent to the gallies for life. Louis thought he had destroyed the Protestants or Huguenots, and rooted them out of his kingdom. Within four-score years after this, the prime minister of France (Neckar) was a Protestant, called formerly, an Huguenot.

† Such an event appeared almost impossible at that time, for the whole nation seemed enthusiases when talking of the glory of their *grand monarque*.

‡ It is remarkable that Louis XIV. from this time never gained a battle; his country oppressed with war and famine, implored him to seek a peace soon after; at this time, he had formed many great schemes which were all blasted.

§ Every trace of the grandeur of Louis XIV. is now removed—every statue of him is destroyed; al hough he then was *idolized almost* by every Frenchman.

‖ "In that kind," I suppose, means, in the same kind of destruction, and that their state would be destroyed like their master's.

¶ Figuratively spoken; for though not literally fulfilled, as to the walls, yet all

"And further Paris! Paris! that imperial city, I will afflict it dreadfully*; yea, the royal family will I afflict, I will avenge the iniquity of the king on his grand children; yes, yes, I will visit thee O Lyons†, yes, yes; and after I have scourged thee, there shall be great glory to thee, O Lyons; And thou Toulose, (Toulon‡ supposed to be meant) I will reduce thee to ashes; yes, yes: thou that art a detestable city, a city of murderers: and as for thee Bourdeaux§, I will be favourable to thee, nevertheless I must chastise thee, but thou shalt be distinguished.—Come on, come on, I have taken the field, and am more dreadful than thine enemies. I will make thee know, that it is not Marlborough, it is not prince Eugene‖ who is to make thee tremble: It is I myself, thou tyrant!—Thou wilt think hell more favourable to thee, than thy own palace. Louis! Louis le grand! There *shall not remain one of thy insolent* inscriptions in France; for thou art unworthy. Satan himself shall not have more misery than I shall give thee. In hell thou shalt be no prince; yes, thou butcher! thou shall not be many years a king; for thou hast set me at nought, and to me it belongs to judge princes as well as the cause of the poor."

Here ends the second warning against France. In the same book there are some warnings against our country, and one begins thus:—"Thus likewise shall England be visited, but less with my judgments than France:" but he proceeds to denounce a heavy punishment on London; which, if this communication is acceptable, I may furnish you with for a future Monthly Repository.

Your's, &c. P. Q.

P. S. It is the fashion of the day to deny every thing we call supernatural, or not to be accounted for on common principles; yet the wisest of us poor mortals, may not after all, know what are the laws of nature and what they may comprehend. The king of Siam, when told by an English ambassador, that at some times of the year, the water became solid in his country, so as to enable people to walk on it, thought it absurd, and contrary to the laws of nature, and treated the relater of such things, with sovereign contempt. Just as reprehensible are some of our learned Christians, who place the doctrine of necessity against the foreknowledge of God, so as to puzzle their brains with absurd consequences, making God the author of sin, and so become Atheists.

"Know then thyself, presume not God to scan,
The proper study of mankind is man.
In a wild maze such vain endeavours end;
How can the less the greater comprehend?
Or finite beings, reach infinity,
For to know God, were only less than he."

its beauty has been destroyed, and every vestige of the greatness of its founder is thrown to the ground, and all his insolent inscriptions, amongst which that impious one—*Nec pluribus impar.*

* And dreadfully it has been afflicted, though no one at the time could have reasoned upon the probability of the manner of it.

† No one who has read of the misery and carnage inflicted by Collot d'Herbois, but must have trembled at this dreadful visitation: the latter part of the prophecy, its subsequent prosperity, still remains to be seen.

‡ Toulon was destroyed by fire in December 1793. Thoulouse has not been distinguished by any great event. It may have been erroneously printed, but which was really meant, is ascertained by referring to some great murders here spoken of committed there before this time.

§ Amidst the universal horrors of the French Revolution, it may be truly said that Bourdeaux was favoured; as it partook much less of the miseries, than most other cities, though chastised in some degree, as this prophecy says, and many circumstances occurred very favourable to it.

‖ The Duke of Marlborough in the battle of Ramillies, and Prince Eugene at the siege of Turin had, the year before this prophecy, gained two very signal victories over Louis XIV.

AN UNITARIAN HUSBAND'S ADVICE TO AN UNITARIAN BACHELOR.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, *August* 11, 1808.

The objections of the "Unitarian Bachelor" to the marriage ceremony are certainly well founded.—To be desired to repeat after the priest in the name of the Father, *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, always appeared to me, to be highly repugnant to the principles of an Unitarian, and what he could not comply with, without departing from them, *pro tempore*. To avoid which inconsistency, I adopted this method, when I "took to myself a wife;" I said, In the NAME OF ALMIGHTY GOD, &c. &c. this I pronounced as audibly and distinctly as I did the other parts of that service, which the law has appointed to be performed, previous to our entering into the "holy state of matrimony." The priest took no notice of my deviation, but finished the ceremony, received his *fee*, shook me by the hand and wished me much happiness. That he heard me I cannot well doubt; but knowing me to be an Unitarian, he probably respected my scruples, and overlooked my alteration of his form of words.

I advise "Unitarian Bachelors" to adopt my plan, and I should hope in general, it will not be objected to by the officiating clergyman.—If the Unitarian Bachelor take to himself a wife, without performing the marriage ceremony as set forth in the book of common prayer, the marriage will be void in the eye of the law, and the offspring illegitimate.—The marriage act allows no marriages but what are solemnized in the church of England, and among the Quakers and Jews. Hoping that the Unitarian Bachelor will soon be blest with a wife, without departing from his principles,

I am, Sir,

Your's respectfully,

AN UNITARIAN HUSBAND.

MR. MARSOM'S DEFENCE OF THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF CHRIST, IN REPLY TO MR. BELSHAM. LETTER II.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, *April* 26, 1808.

In stating the evidence for the pre-existence of Jesus Christ, according to my promise in a former letter, I shall begin with John iii. 13. "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the son of man which is in heaven." Mr. Belsham considers his sense of the middle clause of this passage as so incontrovertible that he says*, "this I regard as a *palmary* argument, and as afford-

* M. Repos. vol. ii. p. 546.

ing a complete solution of every text which represents Jesus Christ as having descended from heaven." That argument ought surely to be very clear and decisive which merits such an appellation; but so confident is Mr. B. that the interpretation which he has given of that clause is the certain meaning of the evangelist, that he introduces it in the following manner*, "Let this then be considered as an *established fact*, and in reading the writings of John let it be *constantly borne in mind* that this evangelist by the phrase *coming down from heaven*, means nothing more than a divine commission to communicate the counsels and will of God." But before we admit this to be an "established fact," let us pause, and consider the evidence by which Mr. B. endeavours to prove that his interpretation of that phrase is the meaning which the evangelist, in making use of it, intended to convey.

Having cited the words, "No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that came down from heaven," Mr. B. affirms respecting the first clause that†, "the son of man had not at that time" (that is at the time he held the conference with Nicodemus) "locally ascended thither, consequently this expression *must* be understood figuratively, *q. d.* no man is acquainted with the counsels of God to man, but," &c. This affirmation with the consequence drawn from it rests entirely upon the supposition that the words are the words of our Lord, (whether they are or are not *his* words we shall inquire presently;) but supposing them to be so and to be figurative, will it necessarily follow that Mr. B.'s interpretation of this figurative expression is the true one? In support of its being so, Mr. B. alleges‡ that, "it is the approved exposition of the orthodox Beza, the learned Raphelius, and the evangelical Doddridge." How many orthodox, learned and evangelical writers might be referred to, who approve of a very opposite interpretation? But the approbation of neither the one nor the other of these opposite expositors can be of any weight in determining the meaning of a passage of scripture, unless that meaning can be proved by an appeal to the sacred writings themselves.

This is the whole of the argument (if it can be so called) advanced by Mr. B. to set aside the pre-existence of Jesus Christ as taught in this text, from which he draws this conclusion, "If the first clause is to be taken figuratively, as all allow; it is surely most natural to understand the second figuratively likewise."

But supposing it can be shewn (as I shall endeavour to shew,) that the words under consideration are not the words of Jesus Christ, but of the historian written many years after the ascension of our Lord into heaven, and that in that view of the passage it will admit of a plain literal interpretation, it will then follow, that to have recourse to a figurative one is both unfair and unnecessary. Or, if it can be shewn that even supposing the words to be the words of our Lord, they will still admit of a literal inter-

* M. Repos. vol. ii. p. 546. † Ib. p. 545. ‡ Ib.

pretation, in either case, the doctrine of the pre-existence of Jesus Christ will be established, the ground of Mr. B's arguments to support the contrary idea overthrown, and his reasoning refuted.

I proceed then to adduce some arguments to prove that this passage, with what follows, is the words of the evangelist. This I shall do by shewing that the verse in question, that is the thirteenth and those that follow, cannot be a continuation of our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus*. If the whole of the connexion from the 10th to the end of the 21st verse is not the words of Christ, it will follow that, there must be a transition somewhere, where that discourse terminates, and where the evangelist begins to speak. That transition I contend, is at the end of the 12th verse; and that in the 13th verse, referring to the local ascent of Jesus Christ into heaven, the evangelist says, "no man hath ascended into heaven," &c. and if the observations which will be offered presently prove the necessity of supposing such a transition, it will I think appear that in no other part of this connexion can it be so natural as at the beginning of this verse.

The abruptness of the transition and the apparent connexion of the 12th and 13th verses, is no real objection to such a supposition; because we have a transition of this writer's equally abrupt, where the connexion and construction of the passage is precisely the same as that before us. "John, says he†, bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, he that cometh after me, is preferred before me: for he was before me, *and* of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace." In this passage, the words, *and* of his fulness, &c. though they seem to be a continuation of the testimony of the baptist, are in reality no part of it; but are, "as all allow," the words of the evangelist. But if we adopt Mr. Wakefield's rendering of the passage before us, "Now no one, &c." instead of, "*and* no one," this apparent objection will be weakened, if not entirely done away, the transition will be easy, and naturally introduce what the evangelist afterwards says respecting Jesus Christ.

In order to establish this point I shall offer the following considerations.

First, I observe that in the 14th verse it is said, "and as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the son of man, ὑψωθῆναι, *have been* lifted up." This I conceive to be the true rendering of the words, and if so, they refer to the death of Christ, or to his being lifted up, as a fact which had already taken place, and make it almost im-

* Dr. Priestley more than intimates that these cannot be the words of Jesus Christ to Nicodemus; but that they are the words of the evangelist. In a note on the text (Harmony of the Gospels, p. 27,) he says, "why may we not consider it," (the phrase, "who is in heaven") as a clause inserted by the evangelist (conformably to what he had written, ch. i. 18.) as a fact (true at the time he wrote) that demonstrates Christ's divine mission, or that he came down from heaven, and the truth of all that he taught? If our Lord really spoke those words to Nicodemus, *they must have been hard to be understood by him, indeed.*"

† Chap. i. 15, 16.

possible not to suppose them to be the words of the evangelist.

Secondly, in the 16th verse Jesus Christ is styled, "the only begotten son of God." A phrase peculiar to the writings of this evangelist: it occurs frequently in his gospel, and once in his first epistle, where the speaker cannot be Jesus Christ; nor is there I believe a single passage in the New Testament where he makes use of such a phrase respecting himself.

Thirdly, in the same verse it is said, "that he (i. e. God,) *gave* his only begotten son." The mission of Jesus Christ is generally expressed by God's *sending*, not by his *giving* his son; this therefore must refer to his death, which is generally expressed by giving or delivering him up, (compare Rom. iv. 35. viii. 32. Acts ii. 23.): and that the word *gave* refers here to the death of Jesus as a fact that had already taken place, is evident from the connexion of this verse with the two preceding ones, "even so must the son of man *have been lifted* up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life; for God so loved the world, that he *gave* his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Where we may observe that his being lifted up, and God's *giving* him, refer to the same thing, and are both represented as necessary to the same end. Now the death of Jesus Christ being subsequent to his conference with Nicodemus it is unnatural to suppose that Jesus Christ should, on that occasion, tell him that God *had given* his only begotten, when the event to which the expression refers had not taken place: I conclude therefore that these must be the words of the evangelist.

Fourthly, I observe, that in the 18th verse it is said, "he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of *the only begotten son of God.*" This appellation does not appear to have been given to Jesus Christ before his resurrection, and it is probable that he is so denominated only in reference to that event; he was declared to be the *son of God*, by the resurrection; "he is the first born," or first begotten, and we may add, the only begotten, "from the dead," to a life of immortality and incorruption. On this account also he is said to be "the first born among many brethren," and "the first born of every creature." If then this appellation is given to Jesus on account of his resurrection, these words cannot make a part of his address to Nicodemus, but must be the words of the evangelist.

These observations I conceive contain such a weight of evidence as naturally leads to the conclusion that the words under consideration are the words of the evangelist and not of Jesus Christ, that they are to be understood literally, and that they do contain a plain and clear proof of the doctrine of his pre-existence.

But should this evidence, after all, be thought inconclusive, yet still I contend that the passage, (if the rendering of it given by two of our most learned and able critics, Mr. Wakefield and Dr. Campbell, be the true one,) will admit of a literal interpretation, and establish the doctrine con-

tended for. Mr. Wakefield renders the first clause, "now no one *goeth* up into heaven, but he, &c." Dr. Campbell renders the passage, "For none *ascendeth* into heaven, but he who descended from heaven; the son of man, whose *abode* is heaven*." On the last clause he has the following note, "Ὁ ων εις τον κολπον τȣ πατρος, ch. i. 18† is a similar expression. Both are intended to denote, rather what is habitual and characteristic of the person, than what obtains at a particular instant. By ὁ ων εν τω ȣρανω, is meant, "whose abode, whose residence, whose home is there. This is agreeable, in import, to the interpretation given by Nonnus." If then, I say, the rendering of these learned critics be the true one, it is not necessary to understand, either the first clause, as Mr. B. affirms‡, or the last figuratively; and consequently, as he admits§, it will be "natural to interpret the second of a local descent," which is all that is necessary to support the doctrine for which we contend.

But let us further inquire, supposing the phrase, "he that came down from heaven," to be figurative, whether it be possible that Mr. B.'s explanation of it can be the true one. He says‖, "this evangelist by the phrase coming down from heaven, *means nothing more than a divine commission* to communicate the counsels and will of God." The phrase "he that came down from heaven," is manifestly a periphrasis of Jesus Christ, and is as peculiarly characteristic of him, and as much designed to distinguish him from all others, as the phrase "he who liveth for ever and ever" is so of the divine Being; which it could not be if it means "nothing more than having a divine commission;" because in that case it would be equally applicable to Moses, to any of the prophets, or to John the Baptist.

But what I consider as decisively fatal to Mr. B.'s interpretation of the phrase is, what John says of Jesus Christ¶ when contrasting himself with him—"He must increase, but I must decrease; he that cometh from above," that is, according to Mr. B. he who hath nothing more than a divine commission, "is above all." On the contrary, "he who is of the earth," that is, he who hath no such divine commission, "is earthly,

* Bishop Pearce on the passage makes the following observations, "no man hath ascended up to heaven, rather *ascendeth* up to heaven, i. e. is to go up thither. The *perfect* tense here having the signification of the *present*."

In his note he says, "the *perfect* tense in the original ought to be rendered by the *present* in the English translation, as it is often used in this gospel, and is accordingly rendered in English translation, in ch. vi. 69. and xi. 27. and xx. 29. and Acts, iv. 10. So in this chapter πεπιστευκα, ver. 18. seems used for πιστευω; in ch. i. 26 εστηκε for εστηκει; in ch. v. 24. μεταβεβηκε, for μεταβαινει, and in ch. xx. 17. αναβεβηκα for αναβαινω."

On the words, "who *is* in heaven," he says, "rather who *was* in heaven, ch. vi. 62. for he came down from thence, as is here said. See on ch. i. 18.

† That passage cannot by any construction of language be supposed to be the words of Jesus Christ, they are most certainly the words of the evangelist, and are naturally expressive of the honour which was conferred upon Jesus when he ascended into heaven and sat down on the right hand of God.

‡ P. 545. § P. 546. ‖ P. 546. ¶ Ver. 30, 31. of this chapter.

and speaketh of the earth," but, "he that cometh from heaven," he who is entrusted with a divine commission, "is above all." By which contrast, upon this interpretation of these phrases, John is made to disclaim what has never been disputed respecting him, what was predicted of him, and what this evangelist expressly asserts concerning him, that "he was a man sent from God." This therefore cannot be the meaning of those phrases.

With these observations I shall close this letter, reserving the more full and decisive evidence in support of the doctrine in question to a future communication. And am, Sir,

Your's, &c.

JOHN MARSOM.

ANECDOTE OF A QUAKER WHO WAS MISLED BY THE INWARD LIGHT.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Hackney Road,
July 4, 1808.

SIR,

I have read your correspondent's letter, signed I. B. in the last Repository, (p. 317,) on the inward light of the people called *Friends*, and though I have no intention of entering into the arguments made use of by this writer, I cannot help saying, that I think it high time that the Quakers themselves should be made ashamed of continuing to avow these pretensions.

In order to contribute my mite towards this desirable end, I herewith send you an anecdote, which is very much at your service.

In the reign of Charles the 2d, it was customary for the speakers among this sect to travel from town to town in order to debate in the parish churches with the ministers, on their own peculiar doctrines. At this time, a celebrated Quaker took a journey from London to Kidderminster, in Worcestershire, in order to debate with Richard Baxter, who was then the settled minister of that place. On the Saturday evening he arrived in the town, and on the Sunday morning as the congregation was assembling in the church, this redoubted champion of the Quakers, covered with his broad brim, walked up the aisle with great solemnity, and seated himself directly opposite the pulpit. The service was conducted as usual, the audience was large and respectable, and as the minister concluded his discourse, the puissant disputant, flushed with the hope of victory, rose in the face of the congregation to impugn the opinions they had just heard, and addressed the pulpit in the following terms. "I am moved by the spirit of God, to tell thee Richard Baxter, that thou do'st not preach sound doctrine." "I rise friend," replied the minister "to tell thee that thou art not moved to this by the spirit of God, but art moved by a lying spirit, for my name is *not* Richard Baxter." Unfortunately for this inspired saint, Mr. Baxter was at this time confined to his house

tended for. Mr. Wakefield renders the first clause, "now no one *goeth* up into heaven, but he, &c." Dr. Campbell renders the passage, "For none *ascendeth* into heaven, but he who descended from heaven; the son of man, whose *abode* is heaven*." On the last clause he has the following note, "Ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τὸ πατρὸς, ch. i. 18† is a similar expression. Both are intended to denote, rather what is habitual and characteristic of the person, than what obtains at a particular instant. By ὃ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, is meant, "whose abode, whose residence, whose home is there. This is agreeable, in import, to the interpretation given by Nonnus." If then, I say, the rendering of these learned critics be the true one, it is not necessary to understand, either the first clause, as Mr. B. affirms‡, or the last figuratively; and consequently, as he admits§, it will be "natural to interpret the second of a local descent," which is all that is necessary to support the doctrine for which we contend.

But let us further inquire, supposing the phrase, "he that came down from heaven," to be figurative, whether it be possible that Mr. B.'s explanation of it can be the true one. He says‖, "this evangelist by the phrase coming down from heaven, *means nothing more than a divine commission* to communicate the counsels and will of God." The phrase "he that came down from heaven," is manifestly a periphrasis of Jesus Christ, and is as peculiarly characteristic of him, and as much designed to distinguish him from all others, as the phrase "he who liveth for ever and ever" is so of the divine Being; which it could not be if it means "nothing more than having a divine commission;" because in that case it would be equally applicable to Moses, to any of the prophets, or to John the Baptist.

But what I consider as decisively fatal to Mr. B.'s interpretation of the phrase is, what John says of Jesus Christ¶ when contrasting himself with him—"He must increase, but I must decrease; he that cometh from above," that is, according to Mr. B. he who hath nothing more than a divine commission, "is above all." On the contrary, "he who is of the earth," that is, he who hath no such divine commission, "is earthly,

* Bishop Pearce on the passage makes the following observations, "no man hath ascended up to heaven, rather *ascendeth* up to heaven, i. e. is to go up thither. The *perfect* tense here having the signification of the *present*."

In his note he says, "the *perfect* tense in the original ought to be rendered by the *present* in the English translation, as it is often used in this gospel, and is accordingly rendered in English translation, in ch. vi. 69. and xi. 27. and xx. 29. and Acts, iv. 10. So in this chapter πεπίστευκα, ver. 18. seems used for πιστεύω; in ch. i. 26 ἕστηκε for ἕστηκεν; in ch. v. 24. μεταβέβηκε, for μεταβαίνει, and in ch. xx. 17. ἀναβέβηκα for ἀναβαίνω."

On the words, "who *is* in heaven," he says, "rather who *was* in heaven, ch. vi. 62. for he came down from thence, as is here said. See on ch. i. 18.

† That passage cannot by any construction of language be supposed to be the words of Jesus Christ, they are most certainly the words of the evangelist, and are naturally expressive of the honour which was conferred upon Jesus when he ascended into heaven and sat down on the right hand of God.

‡ P. 545. § P. 546. ‖ P. 546. ¶ Ver. 30, 31. of this chapter.

and speaketh of the earth," but, "he that cometh from heaven," he who is entrusted with a divine commission, "is above all." By which contrast, upon this interpretation of these phrases, John is made to disclaim what has never been disputed respecting him, what was predicted of him, and what this evangelist expressly asserts concerning him, that "he was a man sent from God." This therefore cannot be the meaning of those phrases.

With these observations I shall close this letter, reserving the more full and decisive evidence in support of the doctrine in question to a future communication. And am, Sir,

Your's, &c.

JOHN MARSOM.

ANECDOTE OF A QUAKER WHO WAS MISLED BY THE INWARD LIGHT.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Hackney Road,
July 4, 1808.

SIR,

I have read your correspondent's letter, signed I. B. in the last Repository, (p. 317,) on the inward light of the people called *Friends*, and though I have no intention of entering into the arguments made use of by this writer, I cannot help saying, that I think it high time that the Quakers themselves should be made ashamed of continuing to avow these pretensions.

In order to contribute my mite towards this desirable end, I herewith send you an anecdote, which is very much at your service.

In the reign of Charles the 2d, it was customary for the speakers among this sect to travel from town to town in order to debate in the parish churches with the ministers, on their own peculiar doctrines. At this time, a celebrated Quaker took a journey from London to Kidderminster, in Worcestershire, in order to debate with Richard Baxter, who was then the settled minister of that place. On the Saturday evening he arrived in the town, and on the Sunday morning as the congregation was assembling in the church, this redoubted champion of the Quakers, covered with his broad brim, walked up the aisle with great solemnity, and seated himself directly opposite the pulpit. The service was conducted as usual, the audience was large and respectable, and as the minister concluded his discourse, the puissant disputant, flushed with the hope of victory, rose in the face of the congregation to impugn the opinions they had just heard, and addressed the pulpit in the following terms. "I am moved by the spirit of God, to tell thee Richard Baxter, that thou do'st not preach sound doctrine." "I rise friend," replied the minister "to tell thee that thou art not moved to this by the spirit of God, but art moved by a lying spirit, for my name is *not* Richard Baxter." Unfortunately for this inspired saint, Mr. Baxter was at this time confined to his house

by a temporary indisposition, and had procured, unknown to the parishioners, a neighbouring minister to officiate for him. This unexpected occurrence was so awkward, and so very unpropitious to the Quaker's claims of inward light, that the conference closed, and the congregation was allowed to depart.

With every good wish for the success of the Monthly Repository, I am, Sir,

Your's, &c.

S. P.

ORIGINAL LETTER, BY A POPULAR WRITER, ON THE DISCIPLINE OF THE QUAKERS *.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, *London, June* 2, 1808.

The following letter, written by an author of eminence to a member of the Society of *Friends*, having fallen into my hands, I deem it sufficiently important, both as to matter and argument, to occupy a place in your valuable Repository. It may possibly lead to some further interesting discussion, which the nature of the subjects may well justify; but should that be the case, it is to be hoped that any opposing sentiments will be conveyed in a style of clearness, candour, and regard to truth, of which the letter itself is a fair example. I suppress the *names* of the different parties, as of small consequence to the public, while the subject itself remains wholly unaffected by that omission.

A CONSTANT READER.

Esteemed Friend,

I received your letter on the subject of a passage in my third volume, and I have no objection to deliver you my sentiments candidly upon it.

I am of opinion, that, where any religious society hold it right to establish a discipline among them, which may occasionally lead to disownment, they ought to be particularly careful respecting what they consider to be crimes. It becomes them not to swell the number of these unnecessarily, but to make wise distinctions concerning them. For, except this be done, many evils may arise. Members may occasionally be turned out of such a Society, who may be men of a more amiable spirit than even others, who may remain in it. The hearts of the upright may also be grieved. And there may be laid inevitably in the constitution of such a Society the seeds of its own dissolution.

I have long lamented that the Society of Friends, whom I have had so much occasion to love and esteem, should not have made long ago a proper distinction between ecclesiastical and impropriate tithes. I have lamented it, because it is evident a man may see good reasons for withholding the payment of the ecclesiastical, who may see none for withholding that of the other kind. I have lamented it again, because it must be obvious, that a man may consent to the payment of the latter, and yet be a virtuous man, and a good Christian. And I have lamented it lastly, because it must always be a matter of deep regret, that there should be in any virtuous society any unnecessary cause of its decline.

* We have been favoured with this letter by an unknown *Friend*. We demurred at first, as to its publication; but on learning that it had been circulated amongst the Friends in print, our scruples were removed. We trust this circumstance will justify us in the eyes of the amiable writer, who, it is unnecessary to say, is Mr. Clarkson, author of the "Portraiture of Quakerism" and of the "History of the Abolition of the Slave Trade." ED.

There is in my opinion, but one question with which the Society is concerned on this subject; and this is,—"how are those tithes which they are called upon to pay, applied?" If it be answered, 'to the supporting of a ministry who preach for hire," friends may, I apprehend, on the foundation of scripture, refuse to pay them. They will have also the example of Jesus Christ, and of his apostles, and the practice of Christians for the three first centuries of the church in their favour. And the conduct of the apostles is the more remarkable in this case, because being bred up as Jews, and accustomed from their infancy to pay tithes for the service of religion, they gave them up contrary to all the prejudices of their education, and preached freely; which it may be conceived they would not have done, if they had not considered them to belong exclusively to the temple, or if they had not believed it to be more agreeable to Christianity, that such a system should be abolished.

The application then of the money arising from tithes is, I apprehend the only question, with which Friends are concerned on the subject; or in other words, they appear to me to have nothing to do in the way of testimony, but with those which are called ecclesiastical. They can bring I should suppose, no proof either out of the letter or out of the spirit of Christianity, against the payment of those which are called impropriate. If they can, I confess I have overlooked it. The only argument, on which I have always considered them to rely, is, that impropriate are of the same nature and root as ecclesiastical tithes.

I fear that in looking into this argument, I shall find nothing that will convince me, that Friends are right in the case before us. That impropriate tithes are of the same nature and root as ecclesiastical, I readily allow. And what then? Does it not follow from hence, that the argument turns directly against those who adopt it? For few facts can be better ascertained in history, than that tithes in Christianity were framed and constituted (which implies their root and nature) exclusively for the benefit of the poor.

But to show that the root is an argument by no means sufficiently firm to be relied upon, I will suppose the following case.

Let us suppose then that government were to pay the clergy out of the common taxes belonging to the state, and were to take the tithes, I mean even the ecclesiastical, into their own hands, and were to appropriate them exclusively to the support of hospitals, and to all the other objects of national benevolence; would Friends refuse to pay them? I believe they would not. I feel assured that the duty "of rendering to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's" (but more particularly in a case, where their consciences could not be injured by the application of these tithes, and where their own benevolent feelings would coincide with it) would of itself triumph over all considerations of the root from whence they came. For surely if friends feel themselves obliged to pay a tenth of their incomes where the root is war, because Cæsar commands them, they would feel themselves equally obliged to pay it, where the root was charity to the poor, the sick, and the afflicted, if commanded by the same authority. The root then cannot be a stable foundation for argument, when this foundation may be removed by a variety of supposed cases.

But let us suppose another case. Let us suppose now, that men every where thought as Friends do upon the subject before us; that in short, the church establishment was dissolved; and that from this time no minister of the gospel of any denomination whatever, was to be paid for his spiritual labours. Let us suppose also that the government of the country, availing itself of this circumstance, took the tithes into their own hands, as taxes towards the exigencies of the state; would Friends in this case also refuse to pay them? I expect they would not. But if they would not, what becomes of the nature or root of them as an argument? But if on the other hand, they should refuse to pay them, and this on account of their root, what an extraordinary circumstance it would be? We should then have the extraordinary spectacle of a conscientious people suffering on account of a professed religious scruple, when its original object, "the payment of a ministry," had ceased to exist. And this would inevitably be the case in the supposed instance, if Friends were to act consistently with their present rules.

But I will offer yet another case to your consideration. Suppose a person

to have been for a long time in possession of impropriate tithes. These tithes he inherited from his ancestors. His ancestors bought them of king Henry the eighth. Henry the eighth laid out the money which he received for them (as the taxes are frequently laid out) in public works. The proprietor therefore sees nothing objectionable in his propriety. Now it so happens, as is often the case, that this lay-impropriator is obliged to pay out of his estate the salary of the vicar, who serves the church in his parish. This he does cheerfully. He has however the advantage when the vicar dies, of appointing a successor to him, which he may do if he pleases, out of his own family, thus providing for one of his own children. Now in process of time this impropriator becomes convinced of friends' principles generally, so as to see the impropriety of paying ministers for their gospel labours. In consequence of this convincement he asks for admission, and he is received into the Society. At the end of the year, or after his religious union with Friends, he is called upon to pay the salary of the vicar. He refuses (and this against his former usage) urging, that it is not lawful to pay those, who preach for hire. He is therefore distrained upon, and he is better satisfied with the sufferings which he experiences in consequence of such distraint, than he would have been with the usual payment and the dereliction of his duty. Does he not therefore in the case before us bear the testimony of a Friend? But let us pursue the matter farther. In a short time after bearing this his first testimony the vicar dies:—of course the patronage of the living belongs to him But he refuses to appoint a successor, though he might materially benefit his family by so doing, urging in his defence as before, that he can have no concern in appointing those as ministers, who receive payment for their spiritual labours. He suffers therefore the living to lapse to the bishop; in consequence of which his family sustains a considerable loss. Does he not therefore in this second case, bear his testimony also; and this in an extraordinary manner, and far beyond the practice of any ordinary member? And yet this worthy person, though he bears this extraordinary testimony, and makes this extraordinary sacrifice to the interests of his family, must be disowned as the proprietor of such impropriate tithes, if his case is to be adjudged by the root alone. Indeed I fear that the root will not support friends on this occasion I fear it will be too unstable a foundation for excluding members from the Society, who have been otherwise persons of good character, and exemplary lives.

You will probably ask me, after this unequivocal declaration of my sentiments on the subject, how it happens that I have not stated them in my book; and you may perhaps charge me with a want of honest independence on the occasion. I will therefore inform you candidly how it has so happened. Though I was aware when I undertook my work, that Friends had departed less than other people from first principles, I was aware that they were not perfect as men; and that there were both practices and opinions in the Society, which would bear some correction. I was aware also, that it was the duty of an author to notice these; and I determined to do it honestly and independently, though in the spirit of mildness and affection. If you will examine my work with attention, you will see that I have done as I had proposed, except in the case of impropriate tithes, which is now before us. My reason then for the omission in question is the following. "Knowing that the Society was much divided upon this subject, I was fearful, lest by a public dissemination of my sentiments upon it, I might bring it to a public discussion among Friends before its due time, and thus become the author of discord among a people, whom I professed, not without great sincerity, to love." The thought of this gave me much uneasiness, and I relinquished my design. I cannot however help stating to you that I wish to see the day, when the Society retaining their testimony for ecclesiastical tithes only, would abolish that for the other kind. That this day will come I have no doubt: I only hope that when it does, there may be no schism or separation, by which its number may be diminished.

I am, respectfully,

Your Friend.

T. C.

NO POPERY.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Hertford,

SIR, *April* 28, 1808.

You did me the honour to insert in your number for December last, (M. Rep. vol. ii. p. 635,) a few thoughts on the late outcry of "No Popery," which have called forth a correspondent, (p. 143,) whose signature is "A Protestant;" a term which is generally used to designate those who protest against church authority, rather than those who advocate its cause, and therefore not the most appropriate on the present occasion.

The design of writing his remarks, is, if possible, says "A Protestant," to quiet the alarms of R. F. by removing the false mirror, through which things are presented to his view. How unfortunate that so benevolent a design has not proved more successful, for instead of allaying my fears, he has increased them, and as I conceive, confirmed my observations.

He declares that he knows of no fresh declaration of the legislature, expressive of distrust towards Protestant dissenters, to justify the alarm sounded by me.

Has he then never heard of the statement of Lord Grenville, in the house of Lords, in his explanation on the 26th of March 1807, "that the difficulty respecting the dissenters was insurmountable?" From the like declaration, in the house of Commons, on the same subject, it appears evident, that the highest authority in the constitution might have been induced to have admitted his Catholic subjects to an equal participation of privileges, but that the same could not have been granted to Protestant dissenters! The majority of the legislature having approved of the proceedings that then took place, and the addresses presented on that memorable occasion, are sufficient to convince any and every one that there is a preference given by churchmen to popery, and that those dissenters who are consistent in their opposition to church authority, men-made ministers and tythe-gathering priests, are more detested at court than Catholics.

What effrontery then must that man have or what ignorance of public affairs, to venture the assertion "that no fresh declaration expressive of distrust towards Protestant dissenters has been made use of." Whether these circumstances are sufficient to justify my alarms, I must leave to the judgment of an impartial public.

A Protestant acknowledges he has not read the works of Overton or Daubeny, and cannot judge of their merits, and asks "are all the members of a church to be condemned for one or two blind zealots?" Who ever condemned every member of the church? Nor do I, like A Protestant, call these gentlemen two blind zealots, but have selected them as the two ablest modern champions and vindicators of the church, the one of the Arminian, the other of

Calvinistic party; and by the popularity of their writings, the opinions of churchmen may be fairly estimated. If A Protestant had much intercourse with churchmen, he would find the names of one or other of these gentlemen continually in their mouths.

I am asked if I have heard of a Hoadley, a Jortin, a Newcome, a Paley, or a Watson. Yes! I have heard of them and read many of their writings with pleasure, though I shall not say all I think of the last of these divines, six months imprisonment and a fine having already been the penalty adjudged for speaking of his character as a public man and a politician, even in this boasted land of liberty. I have also heard of a Fenelon and a Ganganelli in the Romish church, and can look with more complacency on such characters, than on Dissenting associations and Quaker councils sitting in judgment on their brethren, disowning or excommunicating them from their respective societies on account of difference of opinion, refusing to concede to them that liberty of conscience, they have so nobly claimed as the birthright of every individual.

The sentiment which seems most offensive to A Protestant is, the charge brought against the society of Friends, which he acknowledges to be a very serious one, and if well-founded will, he says, justify my alarms.

Now, it is not even pretended by him that either of those ornaments of society I have selected as examples, has committed any act of immorality, or brought disgrace on the society by any breach of the commands of Christ. I therefore re-assert, that in disowning persons for matters of opinion and difference of faith, the Friends have violated the principles of Christian liberty and Christian church-government. In support of this opinion I pass over human authority, because I acknowledge Christ and him only to be the great lawgiver of the Christian church, who has given us a certain rule by which we may determine whether a man is a Christian or not. "By their fruits ye shall know them," says our Lord, and I would recommend A Protestant to read the 7th chapter of Matthew and then say if the judgment on Hannah Barnard and others has been according to this rule. I presume too, that the apostles might be allowed to know something of the proper mode of managing churches, and they have left directions (particularly St. Paul to the Corinthian church) for disowning those persons who brought disgrace on them by immorality of conduct, but no where have they given directions to any council or committee of churches to control the human mind as to matters of faith and opinion.

But we are informed by a Protestant that "the Romish church has forced into and retained within its pale, by bodily pains and penalties, persons whose conscience would not permit them to join her community." That this might be the case in some instances, I shall not pretend to deny, but the question here is, how did the Romish church act with those within its pale, when they were found to have departed from what corrupt people call the true faith? They arraigned, accused and excommunicated or

disowned them, and unfortunately such precisely has been the conduct of the Friends towards Hannah Barnard*, and others: a resemblance this to the Romish church, which vindicates me in calling out "No Popery, Friends." If A Protestant will take the trouble of consulting Mosheim's Ecclesiastical Hist. vol. iii. p. 267, he will there find that the inquisition was founded for the express purpose of finding out heresy and reporting the heretic, and its usual punishment was excommunication.

A Protestant proceeds to state that the Friends have no personal enmity against Hannah Barnard, having offered to pay her expenses and provide her with suitable accommodations on her return to America, and though he does not actually assert, yet by artful insinuations he would impose on his readers a notion that H. B. and others have suffered nothing from being disowned. Mr. Clarkson, the patronised historian of the Friends, has a short chapter entitled, "Disowning no Slight Punishment;" in which he informs us of the support and privileges of which the disowned are deprived. Is it then no persecution to punish persons for difference of sentiment? The society of Friends have, I hope, as little inclination as power to carry the consequences of their disownment farther than this. Nor can it be admitted that persecution is confined to the tortures of an inquisition, or the fines, imprisonments or confiscations of an hierarchial church. All I contend for, and all I have asserted stands yet uncontradicted by A Protestant's letter, nor can he deny that Friends have arraigned, condemned and inflicted punishment, by disowning persons for difference of sentiment, or supposed heresy; a crime which an eminent person observes is created by those who punish it; and that in this proceeding they have recognized the foundation principles of not only papal but all other hierarchies. The adoption of this papal principle with which I have charged the Friends is however a novel mode of proceeding with them. Their discipline was intended to prevent and restrain immoral practices, and in this they may be justified by scripture and reason. I am confirmed in this opinion by reading the controversial writings of that eminent servant of God, Wm. Penn, whose faith seems to approach much nearer to that of H. B. than to the present faith of the Quakers' council, who sat in judgment on her. His book entitled the "Sandy Foundation Shaken," in which the doctrines of the Trinity, atonement, and justification by imputed righteousness are refuted, was not considered by his contemporaries as an occasion for his disownment; a proof that the modern Quakers have departed from their former simplicity and are partaking of the errors of a worldly church.

How lamentable is the case when those who have asserted the right of private judgment and resisted the threats of the potentates of this world unto imprisonment and death, should resign the liberty of thinking for themselves, to a council of their own creation!

* N. B. If the reader wishes to enquire into the proceedings of the Friends respecting H. B. he will find them in the Recorder, two small octavo volumes, published by Wm. Matthews, Bath, and sold by David Eaton, 187, High Holborn; or in the Appeal and Sequel by Verax, Johnson, London.

If the society of Friends proceed in their course of disowning for opinions, they will soon resemble other churches, who make uniformity of opinion the basis of admission into or rejection from them. The most distinguished for virtue and piety, those who most resemble their Lord and Master by going about and doing good, will be of the disowned, and those who remain among them will be of that abject sort, who will sign any creed they think best for their worldly advantage. Such is the case when the mode of judgment prescribed by our Lord is departed from, and uniformity of opinion established in its stead.

It is no wonder under these circumstances the society should be on the decline. Thousands who respected the society of Friends, and were looking towards it as a sanctuary, where freedom of opinion was not only tolerated, but cherished and preserved in its fullest extent, on observing their late disownments, have lamented their apostacy from their ancient practices and turned from them with justifiable disgust.

With this degeneracy in religious freedom, A Protestant must pardon me, if I state another cause for alarm, viz. that the Friends who have commonly borne so noble a testimony against war, and were formerly in the habit of presenting their petitions to the throne for peace, are, as a society, silent as the grave, at a time when war is carrying on with unexampled ferocity. We hear of no complaint or petition from them for peace, excepting a public lamentation in their yearly epistle can be so called; though want and misery reign amongst our manufacturers, and distress and poverty are marching through the land with gigantic strides: a sufficient ground for suspicion that political as well as religious apostacy infects the Friends.

Marvellous, indeed, Mr. Editor, are the days in which we live—the despots of the Continent giving perfect toleration to a troubled world—the government of Great Britain holding fast every tittle of its penal statutes against the sectaries! and the Quakers disowning their members for matters of opinion and pleading the cause of church authority.

I am, Sir, your's, &c.

R. F.

ORIGIN OF HERDER'S STORY OF THE DEATH OF ADAM.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Sir, *June* 5, 1808.

I have been highly gratified by a sight of the "scattered leaves" of Herder in your last number, (p. 252) In return, I send you an extract in old English, which the German, though no servile copyist, must have had in recollection, in his "Death of Adam," (p. 256), unless there were really any "oriental legends" to which both writers might have access.

A work entitled "The History of Popery" is now before me. It was published in 1735 in 2 vols. 4to. and purports to be a republication of "A paper, entitled the Weekly Packet," published fifty years before, when Popery, which this work was designed to bring

into disgrace, was advancing under James II. Among other marvellous relations is an account of Constantine's mother, Helena, discovering the true cross, 300 years after the crucifixion, and thus adding a festival to the church. An old English Homily for that day is quoted from the *Roman Festivale*, p. 100. That part of the quotation which Herder may be supposed to have imitated, is *verbatim et literatim* as follows:

"Whan *Adam* our fyrst fader was seke for aege, and would fayne have ben out of this world; *Adam* sente *Seth*, his sone to the aungel keeper of Paradyse, prayenge the aungel to sende him the *oyle of mercy*, to anoynt his body therewith whan he were dede. Than went *Seth* to Paradyse, and sayd his message to the aungel. Than answered the aungel, and said, that he might not have it tyll the yeres were fulfilled. But have this branche of the tree that thy fader synned in, and set it on his grave, and whan it bereth fruyte, then shalt he have mercy, and not erste. Than toke *Seth* this branche, and came home and found his fader dede; than he set this branche on his fader's grave, as the aungel badde him do. The whyche branche growed there, tyll *Solomon* was kinge; and he made to fell it downe, for it was fayre to the werke of his temple, but it wolde not accord with the werke of his temple. Therefore *Solomon* made to cast it down into the earth, and was hidde there to the tyme that the bishop of the temple let make a wayre in the same place whereas the tree laye, to washe in shepe that weare offred to the temple. Than whan this wayre was made, they called it in their language, *probatica pistina*, to the whyche water came an aungel certain times fro heven, and did worship to the tree that lay in the ground of the wayre, and moved the water: and what man or woman that came to the water nexte after the aungel, was made hole, what sekeness that ever he had, by virtue of the tree; and so endured many wynters to the tyme Chryste was taken, and should be done upon the crosse; than this tree by the ordinance of Godde swamme upon the water; and whan the *Jews* had none other tree redy to make the crosse of, for great haste that they had, they toke the same tree, and made thereof a crosse, and so dyed our Lord thereon, and than the tree bare that blessyd fruyte, Chrystes body, of the whyche welleth *the oyle of mercy* to *Adam* and *Eve*, and all other of their offspringe." Hist. of Popery, i. 31, 32.

The work to which I am indebted for this quotation, displays throughout too much of the rancorous spirit of Calvinism, venting itself not only upon Popery, but also against every Protestant *heresy*. There have indeed been zealous Calvinists (Toplady* for instance) impartial enough in the case of Servetus to "execrate the tyranny that doomed him to the flames," though, as might have been expected, "they give the glorious sufferer little praise," if they do not pass him over with silent neglect. But the murder of Servetus is defended in this Protestant History of Popery. (ii. 351). Grotius had called Calvin *Serveti exustorem, the burner of Servetus*, which it seems "is a bold calumny," because Calvin had "dissuaded," not from the execution of his antagonist, but "from this kind of death," though it is not said where even this tender mercy ap-

* In the "Historic Proof of the Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England." Toplady, whose generally abusive language in that work has so much discredited his cause, expresses himself justly as to the case of Servetus. Adroitly, keeping out of the question the name of his favourite, Calvin, he says, "Is it not very extraordinary, that a person of Melancthon's tender spirits, and goodness of heart, should justify and applaud the magistrates of Geneva, for punishing Servetus' religious mistakes with death? 'They acted right,' says Melancthon, 'in bringing that blasphemer to the stake, after having first granted him the privilege of a fair trial.' Alas, what is man!" Hist. Proof ii. 705.

pears. Such is the defence of Calvin, *barbarous Calvin*, as Robert Robinson once called the Geneva Reformer, on account of the injured Servetus.

Your's, N. L. T.

ANTI-BAPTISTS IN PRINCIPLE, PÆDO-BAPTISTS IN PRACTICE.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

Permit me to point out, through the medium of your impartial Repository, what has long appeared an inconsistency in the conduct of some very respectable Unitarian ministers, with regard to infant baptism. I do it I am sure, not from any invidious motive, but in the hope, that if I am wrong in my conclusions, some of your correspondents will condescend to set me right. It is not my intention to discuss the question of baptism, or directly to reflect on any particular view of it. When any person has studied it and made up his mind, whether it be to discard it altogether as a practice not belonging to our times and circumstances, or that it is still to be performed on adults, or on infants, as a Christian duty, in either case every man will feel justified in following the honest convictions of his own mind. But some who believe the first of these positions, still practise infant baptism, and others practise it who allow that there is no direct authority for so doing in the New Testament. Now is it not strange to hear gentlemen urging on their hearers with all the cogency of argument, the duty and necessity of free inquiry, of discarding all *human authority and inventions* in matters of religion, and of making genuine scripture alone the rule of Christian faith and practice, as the only means of freeing Christianity from its many corruptions, and of restoring it to its primitive purity and power, who are yet found sanctioning the practice of infant baptism, which they themselves allow is not enjoined by the Christian scriptures? A practice which in the opinion of many competent judges, has done more towards corrupting Christianity, and of continuing those corruptions, than many other causes which are assigned. Take one example: original sin and infant baptism are so associated in the minds of the multitude, that the evil effects of the former, it is conceived, can only be removed by the purifying influence of the latter; and that should an infant die before it is baptized, its salvation is endangered for want of the performance of that unmeaning ceremony; this practice therefore is favourable to error and to superstition. Scripture baptism was a public profession of a believer's repentance and faith in Christ, and was the voluntary act of the party. But infants are mere machines and utterly incapable of every prerequisite to baptism. A learned writer on this subject justly observes, "It subverts the very base of the Christian church, by giving those the name who have not

the thing; and by transferring the whole cause of Christianity from the wise and pious few to the ignorant and wicked multitude, who, being supposed Christians, interfere in religion, derange the community, invade the offices, and convert the whole into a worldly corporation." If there be any truth in this reasoning, the practice alluded to must be detrimental to personal religion, and to the rational exercise of the mind on the most important occasion — the choice of our religion. Can gentlemen who practise the rite of infant baptism, and who do not believe that it is taught in scripture, be justified in pleading the "antiquity of the practice," and the "authority of the fathers," that it "can do no harm," and that to "discard it all at once might too violently shock people's prejudices," when they themselves disregard all such reasoning in behalf of those orthodox doctrines which they oppose? This is the inconsistency of which we complain; they admit in the one case what they reject in the other, although the force of the argument and the justness of the application in both instances are precisely the same. The fathers were just as likely to know the doctrines, as the practices of the apostolic church; their authority is as good in the one case as in the other; but to be admitted in neither, if the scriptures be the sole rule of our faith and practice. I am, Sir, your's,

A CONSISTENT CHRISTIAN.

DR. LARDNER'S MONUMENT.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, *August* 9, 1808.

Your readers are much obliged to Mr. Evans for his information in the last number, (p. 364.) It might, I think, be supposed from the inscription, that Lardner was buried at Hawkherst, where he died. The fact is that he was buried at Bunhill Fields, where his tomb, a few years since, from its ill construction, had become literally in ruins. This circumstance being mentioned to that opulent and liber-alminded merchant, the late Mr. Isaac Solley, he immediately directed it to be restored at his sole expense.

There is an interesting account of the death and funeral of Lardner, written by the Rev. Dr. C. Fleming, to the Rev. Mr. Wiche*, of Maidstone. Your correspon-

* Mr. Wiche, was a very respectable minister among the General Baptists, who died in 1794, aged 76. He had "embraced the Arian hypothesis, till" in 1760, "reading Dr. Lardner's *Letter on the Logos*, which had been published the year before, he was so impressed with the argument, as soon after to adopt the sentiment it was designed to prove," and from this time became a correspondent of the author's. "When he met with Dr. L.'s Discourses on the *Three Schemes of a Trinity*, he rejoiced like a man who had found a treasure, and transcribed them with the most exact fidelity, page for page, and line for line; no page nor line of his copy, containing more or less than the corresponding ones in the MS. He would have made a *fac simile* of them, if it had been in his power, but he had his copy elegantly bound in blue turkey, with gilt edges." This *minute* admiration was

dent, Mr. Evans, who was nearly related to Mr. Wiche, communicated this letter in 1797, to the Protestant Dissenter's Magazine. (iv. 434.) As that work had only a contracted circulation, and has long been discontinued, it is probably possessed by few of your readers. On this presumption, I transcribe the letter for your service.

Hoxton Square,
DEAR SIR, *December* 14, 1768.

In compliance with your request, I now inform you that the worthy Doctor died in the beginning of his 86th year; my ring says, aged 85; but I think he was born in the month of June, which was 85 years before he died, and about five weeks. If I remember right, he was educated under Mr. Rowe*. He has appointed no publications; his heretical testimonies are unfinished, though there are large materials thrown together. Four discourses on the Athanasian, Arian and Nazarene conceptions of God are finished, and I hope will be published. A discourse on regeneration is also finished; this I have a desire might be published. And there is one on Christ being made a curse (which I have the promise of reading,) that may also see the light†. His Adversalia and interleaved Bible he ordered to be destroyed. He forbade any funeral sermon. His library is now selling. As to the previous circumstances to his removal from us, they lay thus—he found himself made unhappy by his servants, and was desirous of paying another annual visit to Hawkherst, where he kept the mansion-house unoccupied, only by himself four or five days in a year. I encouraged him to take the journey, in hopes that varying the scenes would have given him some revival; his niece Lister, of Ware, and her husband going along with him. And indeed, he performed the journey beyond expectation; and was better one day or two, as he himself wrote. But on Friday evening they perceiving him change, sent for an apothecary. However he came down stairs Saturday morning, breakfasted, dined, and supped: and on Sunday morning did the like; nay dined; but at drinking tea, they saw the grasp of death conspicuous; carried him up to bed, pulled off his clothes, to which he shewed an aversion; put him into bed, in which he presently expired.

His funeral he ordered to be very private, only three or four ministers; no pall-bearers. He even forbade feathers to the hearse, but that was not complied with. Four coaches and a hearse was all the funeral appearance. Four ministers preceded the corpse down the ground, to the family vault in Bunhill fields. The two first, Radcliffe and Price, who are preachers at the Poor Jewry-lane, to which place he stood related as their former teacher. Amory and Fleming were next the corpse. Radcliffe made the oration, which was very long, and would have been better had it not have been so, yet was characteristic and highly descriptive‡.

surely little better than one of the excuseable *follies of the wise.* "He rejoiced still more some years after, when he was favoured with the liberty of publishing these masterly discourses, to meet the wishes and importunity of two friends, whom he had been prevailed with to gratify with a sight of them." Prot. Diss. Mag. 1797. iv. 129, &c. Mr. W. published the "Discourses" in 1784, and prefixed an advertisement as editor. See Lardner's works, x. 600.

* This was probably a mistake. Mr. Rowe was the tutor of Watts, who was ten years older than Lardner. Dr. Kippis says that L. "was removed from the grammar-school to a dissenting academy in London, under the care of the Rev. Dr. Joshua Oldfield," and that "in the sixteenth year of his age, he was sent to prosecute his studies at Utrecht, under the professors D'Uries, Grævius, and Burman."—Lardner's Life, p. ii.

† This was published among the posthumous sermons. Works x. 506. The "Discourse on Regeneration," appears to have been suppressed. The "Heretical Testimonies," were completed and published in 1780, by Mr. John Hogg, then a dissenting minister, since a banker at Exeter, under the title of "The History of the Heretics of the two first Centuries after Christ." Works, ix. 219.

‡ An "Extract from an Elogium" on Dr. Lardner, by Mr. Radcliffe, (Life, p. cix.) was probably a part of "the oration."

The executor apologised to me, on the appointment of Radcliffe to speak over the grave: but I could not, if he would have given me the greatest encouragement to do it: I felt more than any other man I believe could do of the loss; he was my constant, cordial, and able adviser; and he made me his confident*. I can guess at the reason he forbade a funeral-sermon; he and I had several conferences upon it.

I am affectionately yours, and shall be glad to shew you any respect.

C. FLEMING.

Mr. Evans easily accounts, by a comparison of dates, for the omission of the inscription at Hawkherst, in the life of Lardner prefixed to his works. But had the dates been otherwise, the gentleman mentioned at the close of the inscription as the nephew of Lardner would hardly have chosen to communicate it to Dr. Kippis. The first page of the life contains the annexed

"ADVERTISEMENT.

"After the greatest part of the following narrative had been composed, I received a letter from Mr. David Jennings, grand-nephew to Dr. Lardner, desiring me to withdraw my publication. This letter was written not only in his own name, but in the name of the Rev. Dr. Dickens, prebendary of Durham, who married a niece of Dr. Lardner, a lady still living, and who joined in the requisition. At the same time I was assured, that if I persisted in my intention, they would strongly and publicly disavow their having consented to the performance. Although for reasons which to my own mind appeared perfectly satisfactory, I refused to comply with their request, I acquainted them that I had not the least objection myself to record their disavowal, and to take upon me the disgrace of having written the life without asking their permission. Accordingly I here do this in the most express manner. I here declare, that if, in the life of Dr. Lardner now presented to the public, there be any mistakes in point of fact, or errors of sentiment; that if it be ill written, or improperly written, its faults belong to myself alone, being chargeable upon no other person whatsoever."

ANDREW KIPPIS.

I had opportunities when a young man, to form an opinion of Dr. Kippis from occasional near observation. No one appeared less disposed to assume beyond his province either as a scholar or a divine. His conduct in this transaction I readily leave to the judgment of your readers. They will decide which of the parties appears to most advantage, the relations of Lardner who wished to deprive him of Dr. Kippis as a biographer, or the learned biographer himself whom neither a priest, a layman, nor even a lady could deter from a purpose which he deemed honourable. He too well understood the laws which govern the republic of letters, and which will not suffer that valuable treasure, the story of a great and good man's life, to descend, a sexclusive property, with his goods and chattels. They rather bestow it, as a

* "In the latter part of his life, Dr. Lardner's greatest personal intimacy was with Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Caleb Fleming. This gentleman lived within a few doors of him, and there was a perfect conformity betwixt them with respect to their theological sentiments. Residing so near to each other, for between twenty and thirty years, their intimacy grew up to the most unreserved confidence. My friend Dr. Towers has favoured me with the perusal of a series of letters, written to Dr. Fleming by Dr. Lardner, in which he freely disclosed his thoughts concerning men and things." Dr. Kippis's Life of Lardner, p. xcvi. It is much to be wished that the representative of Dr. Towers, who is so competent to the undertaking, would in some form or other, communicate to the religious world these valuable letters. May I here take the liberty of asking if they are likely ever to be published?

fair inheritance, on any one able and willing to convey it unimpaired to posterity. Such an one was Dr. Kippis, especially in the case of Lardner, with whose latter years he had been personally acquainted, whose connexions were in many instances the same and their pursuits congenial.

I never heard that Lardner's relations took any other means to avoid the imputation of having consented that Dr. Kippis should become his biographer. Perhaps on re-consideration of the subject they might even regret their interference. Your's,

R. C.

QUESTIONS TO MR. BELSHAM*, CONCERNING THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

Woburn,

SIR, *July* 10, 1808.

From the candour and liberality displayed in the letters of Mr. Belsham, particularly in his replies to a correspondent who signs himself "A," and to "A Churchman," in the Repository for May, I am induced to propose to his consideration the three following questions, and shall think myself greatly obliged by his unreserved opinion respecting them. Should a replication on my part become necessary, I trust the discussion will be conducted in such a manner as becomes men who have nothing more ardently in view than the discovery of truth wherever it may be found.

First. Why the manifestation of the Supreme Being to mankind under the Old Testament, should be of a nature so different to that under the New, as in the former case, to command the Jews to destroy the surrounding nations, and in the latter to command us to love our enemies?

Secondly. Why, under the Old Testament, the rewards and punishments were of a temporal nature, whilst under the New, they are asserted to be future and eternal?

Thirdly. Why the writings both of the Old and New Testaments, should be so ambiguous, as to produce among mankind such a variety of opinions respecting the true interpretation of them?

I have stated these queries in as plain and concise a manner as possible; and as you readily admitted a former communication from me respecting the "Inward Light of the Quakers," I trust that your indulgence will be so far extended, as to admit the present article.

With respect, I remain,

Sir, Your's, &c.

VERITAS.

* Since this communication was sent to the press, we have received the following note from the writer, occasioned by a remark in our last number, *correspondence*, p. 456.——"Veritas was not at first aware of the impropriety of addressing Mr. Belsham personally: he however readily admits it: and therefore considers the queries proposed, as addressed to the correspondents in general of the Monthly Repository." ED.

LETTERS TO MR. (NOW BISHOP) BURGESS, ON THE TESTIMONY OF THE JEWS TO THE PERSON OF CHRIST. LETTER VI.

SIR,

Having proved, that neither our Saviour nor his cotemporaries had any idea, from the use of the terms, son of God, born of God, only begotten of God, that Christ was either God or equal to God, I come now to the consideration of some very important questions. 1st. Whether the cotemporaries of Christ had any idea, that he was God, or equal with God. 2dly, Whether they accused him of pretending to be God, or equal with God in your sense of the words, namely, a pre-existing being coeval with, and also the first cause of all things. 3dly, Whether Christ did at any time assert, that he was God, or equal, in your sense of the words. 4thly, Whether he did not positively declare his inferiority to and dependence on God.

That the cotemporaries of Christ had no such ideas is evident: because his friends never express it, and so far from thinking him to be God, were in doubts after his death, whether he was the Messiah. That his enemies had no such idea is still clearer, for we cannot suppose them to be so blinded with passion, as to contend against omnipotence.

That no such idea could possibly enter into the minds of either party, we have the strongest reason to believe, because they were zealously attached to a law, which in every page asserts the unity of God, and the impossibility of his shape being seen by man. Whenever any message was conveyed to men from the Supreme Being, it was either given to them personally by angels, or messengers of God, or in a vision, or in conversation, when the voice of God was heard out of a glorious cloud, but no shape was seen, nor could the mind of man conceive it. With such ideas of God, was it possible for the Jews, who saw our Saviour, dressed like a common man, and performing similar miracles to those of their ancient prophets, to conceive him to be God. I do not scruple to say, that it was impossible, and consequently, that there is no one passage in scripture, in which a cotemporary of Jesus asserts, that he was God.

That the cotemporaries of Jesus might accuse him of the most flagitious crimes according to their law is not improbable; because history assures us, that many of them were filled with an implacable hatred against him. But it is very unlikely, that this charge should be seriously brought against him: because, if proved, it would have answered no other end, than to confine him as a madman. The unfortunate woman, who claimed a right to the throne of England, would, if she had been in her senses, properly have been condemned to death; but no one is so absurd as to think her a proper object of such a sentence in her present situation. So if Jesus had declared himself to be God, it must have been treated by his cotemporaries, as such an extremity of folly, that, instead of crucifying him, they would have confined him in some place of security. We learn however,

that it was with great difficulty any accusation could be substantiated against him, to render him criminal in the eye of their law; and he was at last put to death, because he pretended to be the son of God. It was the want of sufficient proof on his part, that he was the Messiah, which in their opinion rendered him worthy of death; for the same law, that condemned him as a pretender, obliges the Jews to submit to the true Messiah when he comes.

But, because some Jews take up stones to kill him, for a breach of the Sabbath, and for saying, according to their interpretation of his words, that he made himself God, and equal with God, you take upon yourself to assert, that it was their opinion, he pretended to be the first cause of all things. These passages do not appear to me to convey any such meaning. They would have stoned him for blasphemy, because he pretended to an authority over their law, which was the greatest crime imaginable; and when they say to him, thou makest thyself God, it is clear, that their idea was, you take upon yourself an authority, which can belong to none but God. "What right canst thou, who art only a man like one of us, have to break the law of Moses, and to bring as an authority for such a breach, that God is employed on the Sabbath-day, as at all other times, in acts of benevolence?" Our Saviour removed their objection to him, that he was a Sabbath breaker, by shewing, that his actions on that day were not in those prohibited by the law, and we shall see bye and bye, that his answer to them proved, that he claimed no authority, as God, to supersede their law.

I am astonished, that in the present century, the terms God and Lord, recurring perpetually in the Bible, should be so little understood by the generality of Christians. The word Lord conveys to an English ear a very different idea from that in the original. We understand by it in common life a peer, or the son of a peer, and could not, except in ridicule, give it to inferior persons; but the term in the original may be and is applied to all ranks. The Italians and the Germans, whose ideas of nobility differ very much from our's, are freed from this obscurity, because the term which we have rendered Lord, is in their language equally proper for the highest and the lowest of the people, and is applied to the Creator of all things. The same you know to be the case with the term God in the ancient languages; which, though in ours it is by long use appropriated to the first cause of all things, was given in former times to men of rank and dignity. A little attention to the phrase, thou makest thyself God, would have convinced you, that the Jews, wicked as they were, did not suppose that he pretended to be their Jehovah, or equal to him, but only, that he pretended to a power, which could belong to one alone divinely instructed by God, and which they did not believe of him.

I am, &c.

MR. BROOKES, ON THE CIVILIZATION OF THE AMERICAN INDIANS.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Bermondsey.
August 29, 1808.

SIR,

As I observe in your useful publication*, as well as in other periodical works†, that to the Quakers is inscribed the merit of the rational mode of civilization which is now carrying on among the Indians, in the United States of America, and as the Quakers in their publications on the subject claim the credit of it, without any reference to the government of America, to whom justly, I believe, the praise is due, I beg leave to send you the following, which will shew the wisdom and humanity of the proceedings of that government.

In this country, where knowledge and science are rapidly diffusing themselves, it is to be lamented that candor and liberality do not equally increase; if they did, the daily publications would not so often sneer at the people of the United States, nor treat their conduct with scorn; the government also would not be so much calumniated as it is, a government that is a pattern of justice and equity to many European powers, who are daily trampling both on the rights of their own subjects, as well as that of neutral nations; but they contemn lessons of wisdom or justice from a transatlantic power, which probably may be a great nation when they are humbled in the dust.

I admire many of the principles and much of the conduct of the Quakers, but I am sorry to see that in this, they do not appear to give honour to whom honour is due, and therefore, are guilty of injustice and piracy in the moral world.

In Ramsay's Life of Washington it is stated, that about 1794 a new system was begun by the government, for turning the Indians off from hunting to the employments of civilized life, by furnishing them with implements, and instructions for agriculture and manufactures, (page 322): That during Washington's administration, the Indians on the frontiers had been first compelled by force to respect the United States and continue in peace, and afterwards a humane system was commenced for teaching them to exchange the tomahawk and hatchet for the plough, the hoe, the shuttle, and the spinning wheel. (Page 394.)

In Marshall's Life of Washington, 8vo. edition, vol. 5, he states that Washington recommended this subject to Congress in his speech, 29 Oct. 1791, (p. 377.) and again 5 Nov. 1792, (p. 441); and that the Indians had been taught under his administration by arms and justice to respect the United States, and to continue in peace; and that an humane system had been established for civilizing, and for furnishing them

* Monthly Rep. vol. ii, p. 606 to 609; vol. iii. p. 287, and I believe some other places.

† Mon. Review, vol. liii. p. 331; vol. lvi. p. 222.

with the conveniencies of life, which improves their condition while it secures their attachment. (P. 800.)

But upon looking into the laws of the United States, I find one relative to trade with Indians, &c. passed 19 May, 1796, which states that in order to promote civilization among the friendly tribes, and to secure the continuance of their friendship, it shall be lawful for the President of the United States, to cause them to be furnished with useful domestic animals, and implements of industry, and with goods or money as he shall think proper, and to appoint such persons from time to time as temporary agents to reside among the Indians as he shall think fit: provided that the whole amount of such presents and allowance to such agents shall not exceed 15,000 dollars a year, equal to 3375l. sterling; which law has been continued in force to the present time, if it has not been enlarged and improved.

Having now stated the law, it comes next to be considered what has taken place under it. This I am unable to state so fully as I could wish, because the government has not to my knowledge, published any reports of their proceedings as the Quakers have done: various reports have been made to Congress at the different meetings of that body, of the progress and of the application of the money; short accounts of some of these have been stated in some of the American newspapers, but I have not seen any of them in the English ones. To assist in this part of the inquiry I would refer to a letter, inserted in the Mon. Mag. for June, 1806, of R. J. Meigs, who was an agent, or superintendant of Indian affairs, relative to the improvements of the Cherokee nation through the assistance of the government, in which he states that all their improvement had taken place since 1794, when there was not a pair of cards, a spinning-wheel, a loom, or a mechanic in their nation: that they had then (Jan. 1806) above 1000 spinning-wheels, and upwards of 100 looms, that they raise the cotton and indigo, spin and dye the yarn, and weave it into handsome cloth, with which they clothe their families like the white people: that among them are silversmiths, blacksmiths, coopers, saddlers, tanners, shoemakers, and wheelwrights: that these mechanics are principally self-taught, part of their tools are furnished by the United States and part by themselves: that the plough and hoe are in common use among them: that by the assistance of the whites they make saltpetre and gunpowder; that there are several gristmills and one sawmill: that they have large stocks of black cattle, horses, and other domestic animals, and make some butter and cheese of a good quality: that since agriculture and the domestic arts have become the principal objects of pursuit, their population has evidently increased: that there were then seven schools in their country where more than 100 children are taught reading, writing, and some arithmetic.

In the course of one of my journies in the United States in 1802, I met with a committee of three Quakers going from the Quakers in Philadelphia on this errand, to visit the Miamis and

Delaware Indians; and I understood from them that the Quakers had had a legacy left them of the sum of 5000*l.* to be applied towards civilizing the Indians, and that contributions had been made among them to extend and increase this useful work.

I believe that the conduct of the United States in this matter is independent of the Quakers, and that it was contemplated by Congress before they began to do any thing therein, for we see Washington recommended it to their attention as far back as 1791; and it is usual to refer every part of the President's speech, to a committee, who reports thereon to the house: but as I am not in possession of the Journals of the house, I cannot state what reports were made from 1791 to 1796.

With this view of the subject, I think the writer in the Monthly Repository, vol. iii, p. 287 is under a mistake, in saying, that the government has granted an *aid for this purpose, which it has committed* to the same benevolent society, which has so judiciously *led the way* in this interesting work.

I remain your well-wisher,
JOSHUA BROOKES.

GOGMAGOG ON THE CLERGY, HIMSELF, AND THE PRESS.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, *London, Sept.* 3, 1808.

I think it a duty to make my earliest acknowledgments to your correspondent Mr. Wright, for his information concerning the reported "horrid clerical farce," and particularly for the obliging manner in which it is communicated. It is the habit of my country * to feel grateful for favours as well as to resist injuries. And favours are to me doubly valuable at the hands of an order of men (to which I presume Mr. Wright belongs) whose *sacred function* commonly elevates them above a regard to the homely duties of civility and courtesy. I have often wondered that the *clergy*, and especially the *dissenting clergy* (as I, a layman, must say with all due respect,) have never seen that the true way to gain the sway over men's minds is to treat them with kindness: however, for my part, I owe them (as far as I have known them,) thanks for their haughtiness and tyranny, for had I experienced from them candour and condescension I should have been melted into obsequiousness, and should probably have been *priest-ridden*, the whole of my days.

I was much amused with the remarks made by my acquaintances on my last letter, few of them having any suspicion of my being the author, for I have made all my friends readers of your Repository, and some who at first thought it a heavy work are now

* I have before confessed myself a Cambro-Briton.

so interested in it that the leisure hours of the first Sunday in the month are devoted by a knot of them to its perusal. One was affected with pity for poor Faulkner; another with indignation at the cruelty of our penal laws; a third with horror of the stratagem ascribed to the clergymen; whilst a fourth blamed Gogmagog's severity, which was thought to be disproportioned to the occasion; and a fifth laughed at his credulity, declaring his conviction that "the old man had been made to fume (such was his expression in my hearing) by a mere stop-gap newspaper paragraph." I felt sympathetically, with the former class of my friends; and reasoned as coolly as I could (and I can sometimes *affect* coolness, by which I have been told I have been considered as insulting an opponent, holding a manifestly bad argument,) with the latter. I vindicated the asperity of our *unknown* author's style by shewing that the story, if true, was enough to irritate and vex a mind of sensibility; and by conjecturing (in which I find myself right) that an impassioned and perhaps somewhat intemperate letter would be most likely to draw forth an explanation from Wisbeach, the honour of which seemed, after such a communication, concerned in denying the story if possible, or at least in softening it by proper explanation. In the present pampered state of the public mind a writer is not likely to be relished if he does not make a free use of the seasoning of acrimony.—The charge of credulity I was not anxious to repel: when it was pronounced, I smiled at the recollection that for nearly the years of a man's age, I had been branded as a sceptic. "But what," said I, "is the state of the British press, if a story so minutely and circumstantially told, the scenes and actors in which are at so small a distance from the metropolis, which is copied too into an Annual Register, which will be carefully placed in libraries, and preserved as long as the English language is read—if such a story cannot under such circumstances be believed?"—I raised my voice as I uttered these last words, which had so much effect upon my friend that if he was not convinced, he was (which might be as well) silent. When I next meet him I expect he will triumph unmercifully; since, according to Mr. Wright, the whole story of the Clerical Farce is a fabrication. I must be in my turn silent; and I begin to think, if such be the matter out of which books are made, that I may wisely leave off to read as well as to talk. The fallaciousness of the press is a lamentable circumstance; the springs from which the public mind draws knowledge, are poisoned at their source. I know but of one antidote, and with that, sir, you have kindly supplied us: I mean a liberal, impartial, and fearless periodical publication, in which the errors and follies, the misrepresentations and calumnies of our journals may be registered, and preserved for the use of posterity, in a commodious and permanent REPOSITORY.

I remain, Sir, with a proper sense of Mr. Wright's civility, of your indulgence, and of your readers' patience,

GOGMAGOG.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

NOTES ON MATTHEW XXVI. 28; OR, THE EUCHARISTIC RITUAL.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, *June* 10, 1808.

If the following notes on Matthew xxvi. 28, should be found suitable to the plan of your Repository, please to insert them in one of your early numbers.

I remain, very respectfully,

Your's, &c.

P. K.

On comparing the words of Matthew xxvi. 28, with their Greek original, as they stand in Wetstein's Greek Testament, every one of the three clauses appeared to my mind to be remarkably elliptical or abbreviated. After a little attention, I imagined that the requisite omissions might be easily supplied, both in *English* and *Greek*. Leaving the *latter* to be performed by those that are learned in the Greek language, I attempted to introduce every requisite supplement in my own vernacular tongue. What I did, appeared very satisfactory to my own judgment, and I now beg to submit the same to the candid inspection of your readers, in the following terms—"*Matthew* xxvi. 28. This *cup* [meaning no doubt the *wine* or *liquor* in the cup] is my blood, this *cup is my blood* of the new covenant, this *cup is my blood* shed &c." [Here I stop, or cease to express the *latter* words of the verse, because I conceive they require a construction and meaning very different from that which our English version ascribes to them, as I will endeavour to shew in the sequel.] The expanded version as just now given, may perhaps be allowed the merit of *grammatical accuracy*, provided the introduced supplements are perfectly legitimate and proper. But *grammatical accuracy* doth not always express the precise and literal truth: if *any passage* or sentence in a discourse, or an act of parliament, should happen to contain a figurative *term* or *phrase*, the *plain meaning* or the *correct and true* sentiment of that passage or clause can only be ascertained, with perfect fulness and accuracy, by expunging the *figure*, and filling up its place with the *plain and literal* term appropriately corresponding or belonging to that figure. In the eucharistic records or histories, the terms or words body and blood are mere metaphors or figures: they are allowed to be so by the best Protestant (yea by the Unitarian Protestant) divines and expositors, at least while they are levelling their arguments against the Roman Catholics. Hence then ariseth a necessity of something more than mere grammatical accuracy in the translation of Matthew xxvi. 28; the plain and literal sense, and precise truth must be ascertained; and in the present case, I conceive this plain and sentimental correctness may be ex-

pressed in the following manner, viz. "This cup is my cup," this "cup is my cup" of the new covenant,—this "cup is my cup" *shed*, &c. [*shed in preference to many sin-offerings for remission.*] To see the word *cup* repeated so often, in a single and very short sentence, will probably excite a smile on the countenance of scoffers or fastidious critics; but I have learnt to call nothing low or mean and contemptible, that serves only in the minutest degree to ascertain the true meaning of holy scripture. Humble as the department of verbal criticism is, it is not perhaps altogether useless and unimportant; especially when it is considered that most or all of the eucharistic errors and abuses have probably resulted from merely verbal mistakes, or the want of due discrimination between figures and plain or literal terms. To justify the translation of the latter words of the verse, which we are now considering, the following principles are offered. "*In preference to*" is applied to the Greek preposition (περι), on the authority of Homer; (πολλων), by reason of its propinquity and all its grammatical accidents, seems to be fairly applicable to (Αμαρτιων); and this latter term is rendered "*sin-offerings*," because (as Erasmus observes) this same word, in its singular number, must be taken in this sense, in 2 Cor. v. 21*.

By a careful review of the abuses of the eucharistic doctrine, that have crept into the Christian church in different ages, the sole or chief cause of the principle ones, might perhaps be pretty accurately traced: for have they not arisen, chiefly at least, from the practice of assigning literal significations to terms confessedly figurative? The body and blood of the eucharistic histories, though occasionally allowed by protestant expositors to be mere metaphors or figurative allusions, are generally said to denote the real body and blood (or, still more mystically the actual sufferings and death) of Jesus Christ. Hence in the Roman Catholic system, the literal or natural bread and wine are said to be transmuted into the real body and blood of Christ; and the Protestants, following Luther and approximating as nearly as possible to the Catholic doctrine, account that same bread and wine to be the representatives of Christ's real body and blood: that is to say, both the Catholics and Protestants use the terms body and blood (which were indisputably intended to be nothing but metaphorical appellations of the bread and wine) as terms of plain and literal signification; the Catholics resting their expositions with apparent consistency, on the literal sense of Christ's words, and the Protestants, upon the adoption of a comment harsh and groundless,

* The scriptural signification of *remission* is two-fold,—denoting both a release or deliverance from ceremonial, idolatrous and false worship, and, sending back, or a restoration to that which is simple, pure, true and spiritual. Both these significations seem to be comprised in this eucharistic term. Thus restricted to pure and spiritual worship, the word, in this place at least, is completely detached from every sort of reference to the doctrine of eternal salvation through the blood of Christ alone.

affirming what it first pretends to deny, that is to say, the plain and literal meaning of the words body and blood.

In this place, the preceding exposition might be farther illustrated with some additional remarks; for—

1st. As the word blood in the passage now considered, is evidently a mere metaphor, and may be advantageously exchanged for its corresponding reality, the word cup or wine, or liquor, or liquid; so probably the same term ought to be taken, in a figurative sense wherever it occurs in all the eucharistic histories, as in Mark xiv. 24, in Luke xxii. 20, and in 1. Cor. xi. 25.—Admitting this inference to be just, it will induce very considerable alterations in the general expositions of the Christian eucharist; for the terms body and blood, hitherto regarded as the object or end of our Lord's rite, must henceforth be considered only as the figurative appellations of terms that may or rather ought to be substituted for them, (i. e.) of the elementary or symbolical bread and wine, which are the natural means or real instruments, and not the objects of our ritual commemorations. When the body and blood mentioned in the histories of the Lord's supper, are known to be merely metaphorical terms, who will absurdly attempt or pretend to commemorate mere metaphors or figures? In fact, the commemorable object, appointed by the eucharistic law, was something different from the real body and blood of Christ; it was the gospel or *Almighty God's new covenant of remissions and recompences:* and this religious commemoration, considered in its principles, acts, and ulterior object, is the very essence, sum and substance of the Christian worship of Almighty God. The eucharistic institution then was originally enacted and exemplified by Jesus Christ and his apostles, as a standing institution or law for the religious communion of Christians in the public, pure, true and spiritual worship of Almighty God, throughout all ages and nations of the Christian name.

Let it be added in the

2nd. place, that the categoric sentence, ("*This cup* is my blood of the new covenant,") in Matthew xxvi. 28, and in Mark xiv. 24, hath exactly the same import or meaning as the similar categoric sentence ("*This cup* is the new covenant in my blood") in Luke xxii. 20, and in 1. Cor. xi. 25; for of the two sentences, each hath a different *consequent*, while both of them have the same noun, viz. *cup*, for their common *antecedent:* and hence the obvious and necessary deduction is,—that—"the new covenant in my blood," in the latter sentence, is precisely of the same signification as "my blood of the new covenant," is in the former; for in morals and theology, as well in mathematics and geometry, when two or more things, or consequents, &c. are equal to one or the same, common, antecedent or multiple;—those two things, or consequents, &c. are necessarily equal among themselves or to each other.

If the translators and expositors of the eucharistic histories would, consistently and throughout their expositions, take the terms body and blood, as they ought to do,

in a figurative sense, the eucharistic sentiments both of the Catholics and Protestants might be respectively resolved into the two following propositions; the former declaring that the natural or real bread and wine are actually transmuted into two* metaphors, and the latter, that this same bread and wine are the two representatives of those two metaphors. —Propositions more absurd and senseless perhaps than any thing else that can be uttered or conceived! and yet these are the profound and accurate principles on which all our eucharistic interpretations are built.—But this is not all, for to figures arbitrarily and capriciously transmuted into realities, as the eucharistic body and blood constantly are, there were ingeniously annexed the devices of systematic and technical theology; an augmented signification and a meritorious efficacy: hence we have, from the figurative body and blood, the all-atoning but (unfortunately the) metaphorical sufferings and death of Jesus Christ; and to crown all, our great benefactor, for the manifold and extensive benefits of his figurative sufferings and death, claims from us by the authority of explicit injunction, the tribute of our solemn and perpetual commemoration of his person and performances on our behalf. But duly considered, what is the true nature of religious commemoration? Is it not in fact, tantamount or perfectly equivalent to religious worship? The religious worship that hath prevailed or doth prevail, under every dispensation, cannot be resolved in its sum, substance and essence, into any thing more or less than a series of religiously commemorative thoughts, words and actions. Was the eucharistic ritual then set up and introduced for the personal and posthumous commemoration of Jesus Christ? contrary to the maxims and laws of every other legislator, human and divine, that was ever known or heard of, hath Jesus instituted a law to exact for himself the explicit, stated, posthumous and perpetual attachment of his disciples and subjects? Were not our Lord's benevolent principles and actions, by their number and their intrinsic merit and amiableness, sufficient to obtain and secure our perpetual love and gratitude, without the protecting aid of a particular and positive law? Would not the characters and actions of those persons of our own condition and class in society, be deemed extremely suspicious, which needed the security and guard of human laws to perpetuate our memory, approbation and respect of them? Why then will we depreciate the character and actions of Jesus Christ so far as to think that they have, or need to have any such props and fences? Considered as the mediator between God and man,

* In the vulgate version of the Bible there is, I am told, a note on the eucharistic phrase,—'this is my body,' expressed (if I recollect aright) in the following Latin terms—'*Corpus meum*,' (i. e.) '*re ipsâ non figuratè*.' For the truth's sake one would wish that the commentator had used only the word *figuratè*; but in its Catholic form, the note manifestly answers its intention; for it effectually confutes and explodes the representative interpretation of the Protestant's unwarranted assumption and redundancy: a thing and its representative cannot possibly be identical.

the eucharistic institution was his mediatorial, and perhaps his last mediatorial law; and must it not be supposed that this, like all his other mediatorial institutes, referred not to his individual and private interests and concerns, but solely and exclusively to the honour of God and the welfare and everlasting happiness of man? To have ordained the religious commemoration (that is to say the religious worship) of himself, separately from or conjointly with the worship of Almighty God, would have been the injunction of direct and gross Anti-Unitarianism, or mediatorial idolatry; an injunction which cannot be admitted to have come from Jesus Christ, because it was totally incongruous with his principles and conduct from his earliest youth to the day of his death.

While the message, and not the messenger of divine benevolence and mercy, is the commemorable object ordained by the eucharistic law, any direct obligation on Christians to commemorate Jesus Christ personally or individually in the eucharistic rite is totally inadmissible; and concerning every such obligation, one individual explicitly declares that —*Credat, quicunque credit vel crediderit, nunquam Ego.*—

EXPLANATION OF THE 2d. BOOK OF KINGS, VI. 25.

As the following explanation of a passage in scripture was new to me, and may be so to many of your readers, perhaps you may think it worthy of a place in your Monthly Repository.

Dr. Smith, president of the Linnean Society, in a lecture on botany at the Royal Institution, mentioned, that the roots of the plant *Ornithogalum umbellatum*, common star of Bethlehem, are eatable when boiled, and much used as food in the Levant, and are the *doves' dung* which was sold so dear during the siege of Samaria, as related in the 2d. Book of Kings, ch. 6. v. 25.

L. R. I.

REVIEW.

"STILL PLEAS'D TO PRAISE, YET NOT AFRAID TO BLAME."

POPE.

ART. I. *Hints to the Public and the Legislature on the Nature and Effect of Evangelical Preaching. By a Barrister.* Part II. 8vo. pp. 198. Johnson. 1808.

The Barrister's "Hints" have been much read, and have of course excited much discussion. The *Evangelical* or Calvinistic party are aroused, and their vociferous abuse of the author be-

trays their conviction of his strength. The public mind was prepared for the controversy; it will not be suffered soon to drop; and its ultimate effect will be to moderate on the one hand a party growing insolent from success, and to diffuse on the other just ideas of toleration in matters of religion.

This "Second Part" of the "Hints" consists of animadversions on the answers to the former part; further considerations on certain *Evangelical* Doctrines; a fuller exposition of the supposed design of the methodistic party to overturn the established church; and a detail of the proceedings and projects of various calvinistic associations.

These several heads we shall advert to in their order, promising only that our judgment on the Barrister's design is not altered since we reviewed the "First Part," (p. 104.) though the present publication is, we think, superior in point of argument and of style to the former, and loudly calls for notice from the *soi-disant Evangelical* denomination.

I. Dr. Hawker, whom the Barrister first and chiefly attacked, has led the van in repelling his fierce assault. His reply appears to have been couched in terms of self-complacency and affected meekness. He declines meeting his antagonist on certain theological points, in compliment it should seem to his ignorance. He is somewhat wrathful, says our author, against Dr. Blair as a *moral* preacher: indeed, our Tillotsons, Fosters and Blairs have given an unpardonable offence to the pretenders to *Evangelical* lights by their zealous assertion of virtue; not certainly, that these latter mean to represent virtue as incompatible with religion, but that they wish to have it considered as the effect, the necessary effect of religion, though not the essence of it. This is trifling, if it be not something worse. It is a distinction, which when misunderstood, as it often must be, by the ignorant multitude, of whom the *Evangelical* party chiefly consists, cannot fail of being unfriendly to genuine morality. The learned and judicious Paley, also comes in for a share of abuse from Dr. Hawker, who with effrontery, ignorance and malignity unparalleled, says, "that there are not many who have contributed more to increase the mass of moral evil, and therefore deserve less from mankind" than he. One greater enemy to mankind than even Paley might have been singled out by the erudite, liberal and philanthropic doctor; we mean Lardner,—whose honour, growing with every year, would not be complete without the hatred of uninformed, heated fanatics. There is something so detestable in the bigotry of these men, that we cannot much wonder at (though we by no means approve) the Barrister's eagerness to abridge the toleration of them, conceiving probably, according to Richard Baxter's notion of Atheists, Papists, Socinians and Anabaptists, that they are *not tolerable*. It is charitable to hope that Dr. Hawker and his admirers never read the invaluable works of Paley; but they know that he has written on *moral philosophy*, and with them what is purely moral is Anti-christian, what is philosophical is irreligious. After

basely calumniating the brightest ornaments of the churches of England and Scotland, Dr. Hawker complains of personal abuse: to vilify an *Evangelical* preacher is a breach of the ten commandments; to slander deceased moral writers is "doing God service." How daring then is the Barrister to convict the spiritual doctor of literary pilfering, of rifling "Burke's Letter to a Noble Lord" to furnish missile eloquence with which to assail his opponent, of "unplumbing the dead," (if we may *borrow* from the letter alluded to,) "for bullets for the living!" A wilful plagiarism in literary matters is tantamount to fraudulent dealing in real life: the frequency with which this cheat is committed by the *Evangelical* party *, is a lamentable proof that their religion is not so useful to society as the honour or the common honesty of men whom they despise, accounting that for lack of grace, they will perish everlastingly.

An *Evangelical Preacher*, (Mr. Collyer, of Peckham,) has put forth a counter-appeal to the legislature and the public, in answer to the Barrister's Hints: a pamphlet, says our author, "full of nauseous pedantry and sickly self-conceit." The castigation which this writer has received from his antagonist, in the work before us, will do him good, by shewing him (in the Barrister's language) that though "his pompous nothings may pass muster among the old women in the republic of methodism, in the republic of letters we are not quite so amorous of absurdity."

"A Layman" has made an effort in "defence of *Evangelical* preaching," but the Barrister scarcely thinks him worthy of a note.

The *Evangelical Magazine* and the *Eclectic Review* have put forth all their strength against our author, but their strength lies in invective and abuse. In the latter work, there is a philippic against the Barrister, purporting to be a *review* of his "Hints," which in courseness and malignity exceeds any thing that has issued from the press in modern times. The *Anti-Jacobin Review*, (though usually accounted a disgrace to English literature,) is not to be compared to the *Evangelical Eclectic*, in point of personal reviling. There is indeed occasionally a ferocity displayed by the anonymous calumniators engaged in this publication which would be alarming were not their ignorance and folly ludicrous. In the transport of their rage, says the Barrister, they throw away their reason.

"When some home stroke has reached their *solemn* souls,
In vengeance they determine——*to be* FOOLS."

The Calvinistic party complain of the Barrister's intolerance, but they themselves will not tolerate any one in an inquiry into their sentiments and conduct. Good Christians, they abjure for the sake of their religion, all meekness and patience; and are ambitious, in honour of their great master, of pre-eminence and distinction, by slandering their admonishers and cursing their supposed enemies!

* See two remarkable instances of *Evangelical* plagiarism exposed in this work, vol. i. p. 369, and pp. 221, 222, of the present volume.

"There is one great disadvantage to which the opponents of this NEW SPIRITUAL POWER are exposed.—Its members having assumed and appropriated to themselves the exclusive title of gospel preachers and *Evangelical* ministers, whoever attempts to reprobate or expose the falsehood and evil tendency of their doctrines, is instantly denounced as an enemy to the gospel, and one who cannot bear the system of *Evangelical* truth: thus they roundly insist upon and take for granted, the very fact you deny; which is that their doctrines are neither derived from the one, nor consistent with the other; and they forthwith proceed to revile you as a reprobate and an unbeliever.———This was exactly the sophistry employed by the jesuits;—they assumed to be exclusively the followers of Jesus; and when at length, their doctrines were drawn into discussion, and their proceedings excited alarm, they then did as their imitators do in the present day, they pleaded their title without proving it, and proceeded to argue down their opponents with such logic as the following: the Jesuits are the disciples of Jesus; whosoever opposes the disciples of Jesus, opposes Jesus; the enemies of the Jesuits therefore are the enemies of Christ and his gospel. The multitude who did not perceive the fallacy that lurked in the premises, thought the conclusion irresistible. But experience at length discovered to them, that this argument was unsound, and their senses by degrees reversed the error of their understanding. The power of the Jesuits declined, and their imposing title grew at last into a proverbial epithet, expressive of all that is equivocating, and all that is base." (pp. 10, 11.)

II. The doctrines of the *Evangelical* party are again discussed by the Barrister, who seems to declare himself (pp. 73, 74.) an Anti-Trinitarian, but without explaining whether he adopts the Arian or strict Unitarian hypothesis, or whether he be a church of England or a dissenting Unitarian. From the "First Part" of the "Hints," we guessed that the author was an Arminian churchman, and we remonstrated (p. 223.) with the *Evangelical Magazine* for reviling him as an acknowledged *Socinian*. The conductors of that work may now congratulate themselves upon their sagacity; and though we contend that *Socinianism* (to give our *Evangelical* philologists their favorite appellation,) is not in the least implicated in the Barrister's cause, yet as we wish not to be defective in charity, we will hereafter cheerfully allow every writer against the "Hints" to brand the author with the odious name *Socinian*, whenever he finds himself unable to repel his charges or refute his arguments.

On the subject of good works, the Barrister points out a gross perversion of a passage in the prophet Isaiah, common to the calvinistic writers and preachers of the present day, which no reflecting, judicious Christian can witness without disgust. The prophet (ch. lxiv. v. 6.) confessing the iniquities of his countrymen and acknowledging the equity of the divine judgments, says "all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags," or as Bishop Lowth renders the passage, "like a rejected garment are all our righteous deeds"—unaccepted of God because worthless, insincere and therefore *not righteous*. On this fragment of scripture, wrenched from its proper place and true connection, is founded chiefly the *Evangelical* doctrine of the inefficacy of good works; a doctrine which is so repugnant to the scriptures, so abhorrent to common sense and so threatening to society, that the majority of those that hold it are happily the first to contradict it, as well by their other doctrines as by their exam-

ple. It is however a dogma generally held by the party, that vice is less dangerous than error; and the history of their churches furnishes some shocking examples of the practical use of this antimoral, unchristian tenet.

Regeneration or the new birth is an essential topic in *Evangelical* discourse, and our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus is perpetually adduced with triumph, as a scriptural proof and explanation of the theory. The error of the *orthodox* (so called) lies in their applying to themselves language addressed by Christ to a Jew, who was about to see miracles and possibly to be empowered to perform them. To be *born of the spirit* was to be converted to Christianity by preternatural signs. Of this, which is in our opinion the true and the plain exposition of the passage, the Barrister seems not to be informed, for he interprets a spiritual birth of a conversion to a spiritual or holy life.—We who venture to write on this subject are regarded we know by *Evangelical* dreamers as *unregenerate*, but we have fathomed their depths and know their delusions. We do not consider them as deceivers, but we are satisfied that they deceive themselves. We have their pity and prayers, and they have our's.—A story is told by the Barrister, from the *Methodist Magazine* for 1798, p. 273, of one Sarah Roberts, whom the Lord *astonished* with his mercy, by *setting her at liberty*, at the wash tub; and many stories equally gross and profane might be collected from what are called, in the dialect of the *Evangelical*, the "experiences" of eminent Christians. "Experiences" are required to be delivered in most of their churches preparatory to baptism and the Lord's supper, and of such trash as the above are many of them made up. Is it matter of wonder that the sober part of the public cry shame upon these extravagances and fooleries?

The Barrister argues with much ability against the *Evangelic* tenet of atonement by the blood of Christ; with the more ability because he brings many plain passages from our Lord's discourses to bear against it. The orthodox hypothesis on this subject is one of the grossest fictions ever invented; it is the worst part of the very worst system of paganism. It represents God as merciless and unjust. The Father of mankind would have tortured his own rational offspring with the arm of Omnipotence, throughout the endless ages of his own existence, if he had not been propitiated by an HUMAN SACRIFICE!

"With respect to the phrase of 'the blood of Christ,' a phrase sacred in the mouth of all rational Christians, and which ought never to be used on slight occasions, these fanatics repeat it with a frequency that is surfeiting, and associate it with a familiarity that is ludicrous. I will present the reader with one example among an endless variety, from the *Evangelical Magazine* for December last. They were among the last words of a *reverend* methodist, whose life, character and behaviour *is* (are) duly recorded in that marvelous chronicle of saints.—Sunday the 24, on a friend saying, 'take a drop of wine into your dear mouth,' he replied, 'it is a dear mouth, for it was purchased with *precious blood*.' Surely, such language comes much nearer to the irony of an infidel, than the piety of a divine." P. 63.

III. The *Evangelical* party (the most numerous association of men for a particular object in the kingdom) have been of late

drawn into closer union. They have no mean number of supporters in the bosom of the church of England, and they may safely reckon upon nine-tenths of the persons not in communion with the established church. Even the Quakers have shewn a leaning to the *Evangelical* religionists. In fact, the liberal part of the clergy, with their adherents and supporters amongst the body of the people, and the Unitarian dissenters, are the only classes that oppose any obstacle to their progress. Their numerical strength gives them necessarily great influence. They have invaded the Navy, they thrive at the Bank, they bear sway at the India-house, they count several votes in parliament, and they have got a footing in the Royal Palace. Their activity is incredible. They are establishing new institutions for party-purposes every day, and some of the old public establishments are fast falling into their hands. Scarcely a town or village of note in the kingdom but has a place or places set apart for *Evangelical* preaching, which is usually followed by crowds. Numerous academies supply annual swarms of ministers. Nay, every congregation is a nursery for preachers, and that congregation is most honored which can point out the greatest number of popular preachers of its own *calling* *.

Under these circumstances, it requires no penetration to foresee that, unless some new measures be adopted by the clergy and the rational dissenters, the mass of the population of the country will fall under the management of the *Evangelical* ministry. The *Legislature* can do nothing, and ought to do nothing. Argument must be opposed by argument, preaching by preaching. The *Evangelical* party are a religious denomination. The spring which sets the whole body in motion is religious zeal. They cannot be curbed by legislative restraints, unless conscience is to be forced. As to privileges and immunities they enjoy none, at least no more than all dissenting ministers of every denomination claim and enjoy. Lay-preachers, that is, persons engaged in secular employments, are exempted from no burden, by virtue of their being qualified teachers.

It may however be taken for granted that no effectual check will be given to the *Evangelical* preachers by the exertions of the clergy; and the liberal dissenters are too small in number and too indisposed to *hard work* to put themselves forward in a service which is attended with difficulty which will lie in the face of reproach, and which the church of England who will most benefit by it, (in a temporal sense) will be the last to acknowledge. The consequence will be, that the *people* will be given up to the *Evangelical* body; parish churches, except such as are supplied with clergymen of this denomination, will be deserted; the church will gradually widen her doors to the sect, till the 39 articles will be generally believed, and the per-

* "He (Mr. Aldridge, minister of a methodist chapel in Jewry Street,) had the singular felicity of introducing into the ministry *sixteen* or *seventeen* young men, from his own communion." Hist. of Dissenting Churches, by W. Wilson, No. ii. p. 131.

secuting spirit of an exclusive national establishment will walk abroad; and a *gospel ministry* in the church will leave few in the ranks of dissent besides Unitarians.

Is this prospect cheering? We admit, not. But still as Christians, as freemen, we say, "Let the people have their way.—Let them become Methodists, or if they will, Roman Catholics.—Let us see only that they do not as they grow stronger convert men by menaces or force.—And let us anticipate by whatever precaution may be judged expedient any *political* project they may possibly indulge."

We believe that at present, no express design of new-modelling the church of England is entertained by the *Evangelical* party, and that they have not even a wish of reforming it at any time by violence. When they become, as in a few years they will, the majority of the nation, they will (if they think proper) be entitled to demand a reformation. They will have no right at the same time to burn heretics, but we fear their power will not be always exerted according to the rule of right: though it should be acknowledged that many of the dissenters, calling themselves *Evangelical*, are strenuously attached to religious liberty, and would not sacrifice it even if with it should perish the Socinians.

The *political* influence of this "new spiritual power," unknown in some measure at present, perhaps to themselves, is already seen and felt. It strengthened the hands of the Pitt and Addington ministry; it only did not directly oppose Mr. Fox's administration; and it brought in the present *No Popery* faction with triumph. It may be reckoned on as an appendage to the powers that be, provided they be not friendly to liberty. We regard it as one of the most operative causes in bringing on what Mr. Hume predicts as the true *Euthanasia*, the easiest death of the British Constitution———ABSOLUTE MONARCHY.——Still, on political as well as religious subjects every Englishman is entitled to choose his own creed, and however we may lament the course of public opinion, there is no way, when argument fails, to stop it.

We therefore disapprove wholly of the Barrister's 'appeal to the Legislature.' He disavows the wish to persecute, but he should know that whatever the Legislature does by way of restricting the progress of mere opinion is persecution. And if the Legislature interfere, their first object will naturally be to suppress all preaching and publications which impugn the 39 articles, and then what will become of the *Barrister's Hints*? It is easier to arouse than to allay the spirit of persecution—it is a capricious as well as furious monster—and he that awakens it may be the first victim to its vengeance.

IV. In the associations of the *Evangelical* body for special purposes, the Barrister (never departing from his profession) imagines he has discovered *unconstitutional* combinations. How they can be unconstitutional if they embrace, as appears from the Barrister himself, no other objects than are allowed by the Toleration Act, is to us inconceivable. A man is not tolerated in his opinion if he is not allowed

to teach it; and if one may teach it, many may meet together to deliberate on the means of teaching it most effectually. Religious associations have been common amongst the Dissenters from the time that they were recognized by the law of England.

The "Hibernian Society" occupies no less than 30 of the Barrister's pages. We have already given an abstract (p. 51,) of the report of the deputation appointed to visit Ireland last year. In that visit, considering it as taken for the purpose of spiritual inspection, evangelical reviewing, and limited to a month, there may appear something ridiculous, but surely nothing formidable. Would the Barrister have every *Evangelical* believer examined as to points of faith at *Holyhead*, and if the "Village Dialogues," the "Village Sermons" or the "Sale of Curates" be found upon his person, brought up under an escort of soldiery to the privy council in London? Or, if he be permitted to travel in Ireland, shall he be prohibited, on pain of transportation, from inquiring after fellow-believers, and if he find any, from giving them a word of exhortation? Or, is he only to be hindered by the Attorney General from publishing, for the benefit of the *Evangelical* brethren who stay at home in their business or with their congregations, an account of what he saw, what he thought and what he did, by what high-roads and in what vehicles he travelled, what were his fears on the water and what his hopes on land? There appears to us to be something unconstitutional in the proposal either to confine *Evangelical* men to any one of the three kingdoms, or to subject their diaries and journals to a lawyer's or clergyman's *Imprimatur*.

The *Evangelical* ministers in the several counties of England are accustomed to meet some once and some twice and some oftener in the year, for the sake of brotherhood, and for keeping alive in their several neighbourhoods a spirit of religious zeal. These meetings are called by the unlucky term "Associations," which brings before the Barrister's imagination an array of terrible objects, guns and pikes, corps and head-quarters. The *Evangelical Magazine* which gives notice of and records these meetings seems to him to resemble "a military chronicle." He may, we can assure him, drop his fears. These associations are as harmless, though not quite so still, as the assemblies of the Quakers. The brethren bring no other arms than walking-sticks, and the more opulent of them, umbrellas. Their object is to sing hymns, to join in long prayers, and to hear sermons rather better and more lengthy than they hear in common. After service, they mutually communicate the state of their respective congregations as to the gain or loss of members, and probably deposit in the hands of one of the most intelligent and active of their number, subscriptions to a fund for relieving poor ministers' widows. This being done in an orderly manner, they withdraw to a second or third rate inn, where they recruit themselves on roast-beef and plum-pudding, toast the king in a glass of weak punch, smoke their pipes, inquire after absentees, settle times of friendly visits, talk over the publications of such men as the

Barrister, shake hands, pay their reckoning honestly, and retire straight to their respective homes. There is nothing "unconstitutional" here.

The Barrister's alarms so increase upon him whilst contemplating *Evangelical Associations* that he apprehends nothing less than a revolution, and fancies he sees the NATIONAL CONVENTION already established. In the perturbation of his mind, he confounds societies totally distinct, and blends in sad disorder Independents and Methodists, the ministry and the laity. Before he had brought his cause before the public tribunal, he should have taken care to understand it. An accuser who mistakes the persons whom he means to convict pronounces his own condemnation.

In 1806, the *Calvinistic Methodists*, with the well known *Rowland Hill* at their head, "formed themselves into a general body, designated "The Associate Congregations:" and at the Missionary Meeting in 1807, the *Independents* resolved to form a "General union of congregational ministers and churches throughout England and Wales." These latter disclaim in an "Address," containing the plan of their association, any intention of trespassing on the province of the *Deputies of the Dissenting congregations, in and about London, for the protection of the civil rights of the Dissenters*, whose labours they highly applaud, and the printed "account" of whose "proceedings" they recommend to every dissenting minister. Jumbling together "the Associate congregations," the "Congregational ministers and churches" and the "Deputies," the Barrister indignantly exclaims,

"What! are then the LEGISLATURE and the LAWS so inadequate to the maintenance of the *civil rights* of the subject, that this NEW PRIESTHOOD must come forth in their defence? Are the TWELVE JUDGES so incompetent or so corrupt that a corps of CALVINISTIC METHODISTS must form themselves into a PROTECTORATE? Are these DEPUTY DEFENDERS OF THE FAITH to usurp the authority of magistrates, and invest themselves with the *power* to preserve those CIVIL RIGHTS against the violation of them on the part of the existing government, or the abandonment of them by the legal tribunals of the kingdom; for it is only against the encroachment of the former or the corruption of the latter, that the CIVIL RIGHTS of the Community can need *protection?!!*

"Surely these 'DEPUTIES OF THE DISSENTING CONGREGATIONS IN AND ABOUT LONDON,' are taking upon them weightier concerns than are consistent with their *holy function!* If indeed, the purport be to prepare the people to look to the NEW SPIRITUAL POWER for official vindication of their *civil rights*, in this case, the object is to a certain extent, accomplished. But most certainly, this, to say the least of it, is not the shape which RELIGION should assume in society. And those who are thus active in introducing into this country, such committees and associations and conventions, as we are now adverting to, may be among the best friends and the foremost allies of CALVINISM, but they are among the worst and most dangerous enemies of the CONSTITUTION." p. 194, 195.

This passage, made so significant by the printer, contains much fervid oratory, arising out of a ridiculous blunder. The *Deputies* are not part of "the Associate congregations," or "the Congregational churches:" they are not a *spiritual* much less a *new spiritual* power: they are not *Methodists*; they existed before methodists sprung up: they are not *Calvinists* only, but fair representatives of the London Protestant Dissenters: they are not

priests but *laymen*, no regular minister ever acting as a deputy: they are chosen annually, two from each congregation of the three denominations, (Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists,) and are generally the most opulent, intelligent and active members of such congregations. Of the deputies for the present year, MR. WM. SMITH, M. P. for Norwich, (known to be not a *Calvinistic Methodist* but an *Unitarian*,) is chairman; *Mr. Gurney*, the *Barrister's brother* by profession, deputy-chairman. The object of the deputation is to watch over the rights and privileges of their constituents and of their brethren throughout the kingdom, and to defend them from the encroachments of the national church on the one side and of the *Methodists* on the other. The Barrister will not deny that Dissenters have "civil rights," or that they may legally associate for their protection, or if needful, their enlargement: and the history of the proceedings of their deputies (which we recommend him to peruse before he writes the third part of the Hints) will shew him numberless instances of the utility of the plan of association which they have long adopted.—We have discharged our duty in pointing out this egregious mistake; the Barrister will not have fulfilled his, till he has acknowledged and corrected it. His pamphlet will circulate where this article cannot be read, and amongst persons who have no knowledge of the Dissenters but what they may learn from his erroneous statements; it behoves him therefore as a friend to truth and candour to enter his justification of the deputies upon the same record in which they have been so strangely mis-represented.

In several passages of the Hints, besides the above, the Dissenters in general are treated as *Methodists*, and there seems to be a wish to provoke a spirit of opposition towards them on the part of the church of England. If this be not the Barrister's design, if either his language be only unguarded or we have misinterpreted it, we shall be glad to receive his own explanation.

We closed our review of the first part of the "Hints" with advising the author to be more studious in future of correctness of composition and typography. The second part (as we have before acknowledged) less offends the eye and taste of the reader, but it is not without errors. In one and the same sentence, (p. 85,) the Barrister uses the tautological epithet, which we observed in the former publication, "*moral* virtue," and designates *Paley* by the improper appellation *Mr.*

The length to which we have extended this Review, considering the subject to be of the first importance, allows us only to add that we wish to be moderators between the Barrister and the *pseudo Evangelical* religionists. Their sentiments we reject and abhor: His spirit and design we cannot but dislike. They offend against truth: He against charity.

ART. II. *The Proneness of a philosophizing Spirit to embrace Error; with Remarks upon Mr. Lancaster's new System of Education, pointing out its Defects and Errors with regard to religious Instruction and moral Management: A Sermon preached at the yearly Meeting of the Sunday Schools in the Collegiate Church of Manchester, on Monday, May* 18, 1807. *By the Rev.* R. Barlow. 8vo. pp. 32. 1808.

Mr. BARLOW is master of the Free Grammar School of Winwick, and we doubt not well qualified for teaching country lads *propria quæ maribus*, and inspiring them with awe of the schoolmaster, and reverence of the clergyman of the parish. As the opponent of Mr. Lancaster he is not quite so respectable. He and Mrs. Trimmer are to all appearance good sort of people, but persons of this description are best *at home*; before the public they make no figure.

Why, we asked ourselves when we received this pamphlet from our booksellers, is this alarm concerning Mr. Lancaster? What has he done, or is he doing, to revive our fears of Jacobinism and atheism, of liberty, fraternity, and equality? Truly, the cause of these apprehensions and fears is that he has invented, or rather anglicised a mode of education, by which the poor may be cheaply, speedily, and effectually taught reading, writing, and arithmetic; and all this without any provision for their being indoctrinated with the Athanasian creed; this sensible and ingenious Quaker professing himself satisfied, if he can make boys and girls strictly moral, faithful, decent, obedient, and tractable. It is the growth of knowledge which terrifies our elderly country esquires, village clergymen who left college half a century agone, and ancient maids who never felt a wish to read more than the Common Prayer Book and Bible with the Apocrypha. The fear of knowledge seems to indicate a belief that knowledge is an enemy. It detects and exposes unfounded claims, casts contempt upon ignorance however caparisoned, makes adulation appear base and despicable, and sets up resistance to oppression. Hence the uninformed, the superstitious, the proud and the tyrannical speak of it "with no friendly voice," and call to it only to "tell it how they hate its beams."

Mr Lancaster is a harmless Quaker, making no higher pretensions than to good sense, and a competent share of information; but the master of Winwick school represents him as a philosopher, who with the formidable engine of education threatens to "undermine and destroy every established form of religion." The church is in danger, because boys are to be seduced into good behaviour by the high sentiments of emulation and pride, and not by the fear of the rod, and the dread of "Him, who has 10,000 ways of making them extremely miserable;" "corporal punishment is excluded, and the dictates of the divine wisdom of Solomon are become obsolete!" little sinners are to be shamed out of vice by ridicule! school learning is disjoined from

the doctrines of "the original depravity of human nature and of the atonement of Christ!" And the danger is the greater, because on this system one master can teach 1000 boys, and at the trifling expence of half a crown a head! A few agents therefore, with apparently insignificant means will be able to accomplish a revolution in the land, more fatal than that of France.

But we sicken, while we laugh at the folly of the advocates of ignorance. If we allow them the praise of sincerity, what sentiment is there in the human breast that shall shield them from contempt?

The Catholics too according to Mr. Barlow are philosophers, and he cannot restrain his indignation at seeing "a religion, which the revolting consciences of our forefathers had consigned to reprobation, emerging from the silence into which a generous toleration had shamed it, and stretching forth the hand of fellowship to our church." It would be a novel, if not an edifying instance of religious zeal, in the populace of Manchester, to set fire with the same hands to Roman Catholic chapels and Mr. Lancaster's school rooms!

ART. III. *The Propriety of the Time of Christ's appearance in the World; with Reflections on the Nature and Utility of Public Worship. A Sermon preached May* 23, 1808, *at the opening of the New General Baptist Meeting-House, Cranbrook, in Kent. By* John Evans, A. M. 8*vo. pp.* 33. Symonds. 2nd. Edition.

The subject of this discourse which Dr. Robertson's beautiful and original sermon has made familiar to most theological readers, is here treated in a plain, sensible, liberal manner. The reflections on public worship bear the same character.

In a *preface*, Mr. Evans gives an account of the whole service on ope ing the new meeting house at Cranbrook, and also of the religious proceedings of the annual association of the General Baptists in Kent, held in this place the next day.

ART. IV. *The Importance of educating the Poor. A Sermon, preached July* 17, 1808 *at the Black Friars, Canterbury, in behalf of the Royal Free School, recently established in that City. By* John Evans, A. M. 8*vo. pp.* 36. Symonds. 2nd Edition.

A spirit of liberality and benevolence pervades this discourse, which is creditable to the author, and harmonizes with its object; the recommendation of a free-school recently established at Canterbury on Mr. Lancaster's plan, in which "about three hundred boys, and near (*nearly*) one hundred girls" are taught reading, writing, and arithmetic. The institution of this school is the more honourable to the inhabitants of Canterbury, as the Primate of England, residing amongst them, is known to be inimical to the measure!

Mr. Evans labours with laud-

able zeal to prove the truth of the wise man's maxim, *that the soul be without knowleage, it is not good*; a truth so self-evident, and so important, that the necessity of defending it is no light imputation on the wisdom and virtue of the present times. For this *labour of love*, the author is entitled to the thanks of all his enlightened countrymen.

The King has to his honour been the steady patron of Mr. Lancaster, whom he has favoured with several interviews. This circumstance is naturally brought forward by Mr. Evans, in connection with an expression of his Majesty's, which is praised in terms of glowing loyalty.

"It was a noble wish, which our *aged and venerable Monarch* is said to have lately expressed to Mr. Lancaster, the benevolent projector of these schools, I WOULD HAVE EVERY POOR CHILD IN THE NATION ABLE TO READ THE BIBLE. This was a saying worthy the head of the Protestant established church —it is a jewel in his crown, whose lustre shall never fade away!" (p. 28, 29.)

To the sermon is affixed a letter of *Sir Richard Philips's*, the present sheriff of London, to G. Cumberland, Esq. of Bristol, dated June 29, 1808, on "the precise case of the prisoners in the metropolis as to knowledge," in which Sir Richard states (what is surely an argument in favour of the instruction of the poor,)

"That by far the majority can neither read nor write; that of 152 prisoners, upwards of *one hundred* can only make a *mark*, instead of signing their name; that when bibles and testaments were lately sent for their use, they were altogether useless to most of them; and finally, that the generality of prisoners are so ignorant that they seem to have no sense of the obligation of the laws or any consciousness of religious feeling." (p. 21.)

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

THE injuries and contumelies sustained by the virtuous head of the Romish church, says a morning paper, ought to be recorded. And indeed they ought to be recorded, not as this paper wishes, to excite compassion for the falling state of that abominable and wicked government, which has so long oppressed mankind, and which still retains in spiritual fetters the inhabitants of many extensive kingdoms, but to excite the veneration and awe of all true Christians, and to prove to them, that however long and powerful may be the domination of falsehood, it must come to an end, and the pure church of Christ will at last be triumphant over the wicked acts of popes, cardinals, patriarchs, councils and various bodies of various kinds, who have set their own traditions paramount to the word of God and the faith delivered to us by Christ and his apostles. We request the true Christian to consider this. Abandoned as the church of Rome has been, and sinking as it now is into deserved contempt, let the Christian reflect, whether he is in his own church upholding a similar disgraceful usurpation. For there can be no distinction. Our Lord and Master admits of no rival. The pope's claims are disavowed by every Protestant; yet how many are there, who submit their minds to a more contemptible domination, that of the petty pope of a meeting-house! The Bible is said to be the religion of Protestants; so the law of Moses was the law

of the Jews; but the Pharisees by their traditions made the latter of no effect, and Protestants by a lazy acquiescence in the traditions of Luther and Calvin, and similar unauthorised frames of doctrines, have set up a rule of faith, contrary to that of the scriptures. To the scriptures then let every man turn; and let his faith be guided by what he finds there, not by prescribed rules or articles of faith from any human authority.

The pope has recourse now to prayers. He does not speak in thunder. The same features of deceit are visible in his fallen as in his prosperous state. He pretends now to call himself the minister of peace, and he still asserts that he held the place of God upon earth. Impious assertion! whence did he derive his power, but from the worst of arts: and if he held the place of God, his God must have been a being like the Moloch of the ancients, not the God of peace, the God of our Saviour Christ. The manifesto of this pretended holiness denominates him the head of religion—the universal pastor—the common father of all the faithful—the representative of God—the vicar of Christ. It protests in the strongest terms against the usurpation of his states, declares it to be unjust, void, null, and of no effect, reasons with the French emperor on the gift of the patrimony of the church, and at last submits the whole with a spirit of patience and resignation to the decrees of Providence. Such is the state of this once so much dreaded and awful power. Whatever else we may think of the French Revolution, it has had the good effect of lowering the papal see, and we could almost flatter ourselves, that the time is coming for its destruction. We fear however, that it will revive; and that the body of cardinals will not be kept separate from each other, so as to prevent the election of another father of delusion and lies.

Another paper on the same day has set forth in strong, though we fear too true colours, the badness of the temporal government of the Pope, so that no lover of liberty can lament its destruction. No less than two thousand assassinations were committed annually during the reign of the last pope, and these were seldom punished, because the pardons brought in a revenue to his valet de chambre. And how deficient the pope's temporal government must be in the ordinary affairs of life, must be evident from a tax being laid not upon the land, but on its produce: so that the head of the church is the great corn-factor, raising or falling the price of corn at his own pleasure. The politician will therefore rejoice at the destruction of his temporal and the Christian at the total annihilation of his spiritual power.

But is the influence of superstition likely soon to come to an end? A great commotion has taken place in Spain—its inhabitants are in arms to fight in defence of their liberty and independence: but has religious liberty gained ground amongst them? or are their minds sufficiently enlightened to receive the pure truths of the gospel? What shall we think of them, when the manifestos of their juntas and the letters of their generals are full of impious allusions, and the glory of their successes is attributed to the vile abominations, which are the objects of their ridiculous and childish worship? We may judge into what a state of degradation the nation must be fallen, when every member of the junta of one province is obliged to subscribe to the belief of an absurdity, which however long it may have been established, ought at this period to be regarded with contempt. We have seen indeed in our own country, that an aged clergyman has been treated with the utmost severity for declaring his belief, that Mary, the mother of Jesus, produced him to the world in lawful and honourable wedlock, like other women. The Bishops of London and Lincoln, and Sir William Scott, joined in this act; but not one of the three combated the able arguments, which the venerable pastor produced! and, though the clergyman is punished, the nation is at liberty to believe as it pleases, and to take the side of the two bishops and the knight, or that of the single clergyman: they may do more, they may weigh the arguments which that clergyman advanced, and according to their vaildity establish their faith.

Not so in Spain. The conception of Jesus must be spoken of in a very different manner. The Spaniards would not be content with the declarations of the bishops of London and Lincoln and Sir William Scott, but would deprive them of their posts, and confine them in an Inquisition for a declaration of their faith. Mr. Stone asserts, that Jesus was born in the common way of generation: for this the bishops of Lon-

don and Lincoln, and Sir William Scott have called him over the coals, because according to the doctrine of the church of England, Jesus was born of a virgin and conceived by the Holy Ghost. However, the question, whether the conception was immaculate or not, is left at large in the church of England. The Spaniards make every member declare, that he believes in the immaculate conception of the holy virgin, the mother of God.

How prone is the human mind to folly! and, how easily it is led from one device of the imagination to the most contemptible absurdities! In one part of the world they actually believe at this time, that a young child is god; in our part of the world the impious term, the mother of God, is familiar to the mouths of numbers, and its shocking impiety and blasphemy are not observed. In the early ages of the Christian religion, a crucified saviour shocked the feelings of the heathens, and unwise and unscriptural Christians endeavoured to modify the ignominy of his death, by changing the nature of Christ. The heathens, accustomed to the strangest tales of their gods, greedily swallowed the fiction; and, when they had made the son a god, it followed of course that the title of his mother should be raised; and Ephesus, the city of superstition, exalted the poor woman of Nazareth into the strange character of the mother of God. It was natural, that this should give rise to various fictions and fables; and amongst the rest, the immaculate conception became a point of great importance. This is woven into the faith of the Spaniards, and is become a matter of state. This is the test of the members of the Junta. How thankful ought Protestants to be, that they are released from this absurdity at least; and how careful not to admit into their creed any articles so repugnant to Christianity. The faith of a Christian ought to depend on Christ's own words, and not on the vain and silly decrees of a pack of priests, meeting in councils, and forming heterogeneous creeds, worthy only of laughter and contempt, if they had not, by the perverseness of those priests, introduced so much strife and bloodshed into the world.

But, if the mass of the people in Spain labour under such delusions, it is evident by the writings of others, that there are many enlightened persons in that kingdom, who are well acquainted with the general principles of civil liberty. The country is in a very singular situation. Each province is at present under the government of its peculiar Junta: and these Juntas will be of great service in the grand conflict, in which they are likely to be engaged. But all seem to have seen fully the necessity of a central government, and they have wisely concluded, that this government should emanate from the Juntas as at present constituted. Deputies have therefore been appointed from each Junta, and they are to meet in Cividad reale, to take upon themselves the great concerns of the kingdom. By this a union of action will be obtained: and as long as the inferior Juntas act in subservience to this new administration, their affairs are likely to be managed with great wisdom and prudence. In this administration probably will be fixed the nature of the future representative government, and some general laws will be determined upon for the establishment of the monarchy.

This is a new occurrence in human affairs. We have seen in France the effects of a Convention to restore the constitution of the kingdom. The Bourbon family had annihilated all the restraints of the monarchy, and the people gained the power of subverting their oppressors, but had not the discretion requisite to establish a good form of government. Running into every excess they soon became tired of anarchy, and sunk at last contented in the arms of military despotism. In Spain there seems to be a disposition to attend to the principles of their old free constitution, to establish a cortez or meeting of deputies from all parts of the kingdom, and to restore the monarchy under the control of the representative system. This country has been so long governed under very bad principles, that any change must be for the better, and the difficulties they have to encounter will rouse their minds from that torpor and sloth, which has so long rendered useless the gifts of nature on a country, formed for every comfort and advantage, that the temperate zone can produce.

The south and middle of Spain are freed from the French yoke; every where in these parts the French have been obliged to give way, and the French elected king has retreated with all his

forces to Burgos, there to wait for reinforcements We expect to hear every day of fresh attacks made upon them by the Spaniards, and if they could overpower them, before reinforcements arrived, it would be a great thing for the country. They must expect a terrible conflict. Buonaparte will not easily give up his intended prey. He is collecting immense forces to enter Spain, and the contest will be awful. On the one hand a people is fighting for liberty and independence. on the other a nation for victory and glory, disdaining to receive a check from a kingdom it despised. Such is the state of men professing to be Christians. Tearing each other like brutes, they shew how little reason has been suffered to make its way in the world, and that we are rather content to bear the yoke of our passions, than to submit to the gentle restraints of the gospel. Love your enemies, says Christ, and pray for them: tear your enemies to pieces, says human policy, and, if you cannot otherwise obtain your ends, let destruction go before you, and convert a fruitful country into a wilderness.

In Portugal, strange things have happened. The English landed, beat the French in two battles, and when the news was expected that we were in possession of Lisbon, and that the French had surrendered at discretion, accounts were received of a capitulation or convention, by which it was agreed, that the French should be sent back into their own country, with arms and ammunition and all the plunder they had accumulated. The Russian sailors were also to be sent back to Russia: but the Russian ships are to be kept by us during the war, and they are to be restored six months after peace is concluded. Public indignation was very great at the arrival of such news, and so disgraceful a convention is not easy to be accounted for; since it restores to the French a body of troops to march into Spain, and gives to the Russian emperor sailors to act against Sweden. The French army and the Russian sailors could do no harm in Lisbon; they now become qualified to enter into the contest of nations with ardour.

Constantinople affords another instance of the baseness of its government. Another sultan has been deposed. The army has effected the change; and the last of the Othman race is now upon the throne. It is needless to inquire, what were the causes of this new revolution. Where despotism prevails, the life of the sovereign is never secure; and this ought to be a lesson to kings, that their greatest wisdom is to govern by fixed laws, and to make a common cause with their people. To permit a standing army in a country is always a dangerous thing. No king is safe with one, yet few kings love to be without them. As children are fond of noisy toys, so kings are too often led away by the vanity of fine troops and numerous armies.

In the North, the affairs of the king of Sweden seem to be improved; he has met with successes in Finland, and by the assistance of two of our ships has repulsed the Russian fleet. The great inferiority of Russian tactics was seen in the engagement, as with nine ships they suffered two of ours to drive them before them, and to burn a ship of their line. There is no danger of either Swedes or Russians learning our discipline: for the men must be new modelled, before they can manœuvre upon sea like Englishmen.

At home, nothing very particular has happened; but the execution of an officer in the army* for fighting a duel, and killing his adversary, must necessarily excite a sensation in the class of men, who call themselves men of honour. Two officers disputed on a trifling subject, and one, very much offended, sent for the other, and in their mess room, no other person being present, a duel is supposed to have taken place. This is certain, that one was killed, and the other has been hanged for killing him. To use the terms of men of honour, this was not a fair duel; for there were no seconds. It will however lead men in the army and out of the army, to consider of the folly and impiety, of sending a fellow creature out of the world, for some trifling expression, which candid men might easily soften, and prevent bloodshed. For our own parts, we are not inclined to give a duellist any credit for courage; for so strange are the rules of the men of the world, that a man, enlisting under them and rejecting the law of God, is under the basest tyranny. He must risk his life in single combat, or be disgraced. We have no doubt, that in some future time men will be found, who have the courage to refuse a duel; but they must be men, who have the courage to act up to Christian principles, whatever their

* Major Campbell.

comrades may think of them; and in the day of real conflict, we have no doubt that the refuser of duels, will perform in the best manner his duty to his king and country. What shall we say of an officer, who aims a ball at the breast of a brother officer at the time when the services of both are called for? Ought he not to be considered as an enemy to his king and country?

OBITUARY.

Last year, at the house of his youngest son, at High Wycombe, in Bucks, Mr. JOHN WORSLEY, in the seventieth year of his age; well known for thirty years, as master of a respectable boarding-school at Hertford, which had for fifty years before been supported with great credit and usefulness by his father, the translator of the New Testament, a superior scholar, and peculiarly well versed in Grecian lore. Mr. John Worsley had been known by the publication of a Latin grammar, in which the rules are given in English, and the declensions of the verbs exhibited in a simple and easy form: also, by a paradigm of the French verbs, drawn out on the same plan. There are many still living, formerly his pupils, who will bear witness to the value of his instructions, the mildness of his disposition and his unwillingness to employ even that necessary severity without which places of education cannot be kept in order. A sincere friend of man, and a patron of every scheme that could tend to public good, he was always foremost in the rank of subscribers, and freely gave his personal attendance where it might be productive of any benefit to the cause of benevolence. Easy in his mind and happy in his temper, he felt not many of those storms of life which break the repose of restless mortals. Believing that the morrow would take thought for the things of itself, he saw no need of taking an anxious thought for the morrow; and, convinced that evils enow would fall to his portion upon earth, he never made any designedly for himself, nor had any inclination to meet them on their road, or give them a welcome by shewing them a habitation ready furnished for their reception. In his breast, sorrow rested but a short time, hope and confidence in the good providence of God obtained a perfect government there; and while he knew that human life would always be chequered, he thought its brightest spots best deserved his attention and care. The tender friend of his children, he seemed to disregard his own wants in order to supply theirs; and, as their families increased, and they required his help, he gave an example which but few parents will follow, of despoiling himself that he might make them happy.—— Let the grateful incense of piety perfume the ashes of the dead, and while their memory lives in our hearts may their virtuous actions be copied in our lives!

Lately, at the advanced age of seventy years, JOSEPH WIDDOWSON, who during a laborious and profitable life supported a character of perfect integrity, dignity and usefulness, in the society of Lincoln. Of his death it may be truly said, that he came in like a shock of corn fully ripe. With no other friend than his industry he began his worldly career, and after having brought up a large family in a genteel way, and seen them settled comfortably and respectably in life, he retired from business a short time before his death, to enjoy the savings of prudence, economy and sobriety. The world has seldom seen a more determined friend of gospel truth. Naturally of a keen and active mind, he threw off the trammels of prejudice and of custom at an early age, and launched out fearlessly into the ocean of opinions, with his uninstructed reason for a pilot. It may be presumed that in so bold an adventure, he found himself sometimes at a loss. He was educated in Calvinistic principles, and feeling their importance (for truth under any form was important to him,) he followed them up to their consequences, and with a small number of friends became a Rellyan Universalist, called an Antinomian. This band of

Joseph Widdowson.

brothers met for a private service which they sedulously attended every sabbath day for nearly twenty years. While thus situated, Mr. Vidler preached at the Baptist chapel. They were his hearers; their minds were open; his arguments appeared to them conclusive; and most of them became speedily converts to his view of universal redemption. Soon after this the apostle of Unitarianism in the North passed through the city of Lincoln. He sought for a place in which he might preach salvation by that faith in Christ which worketh by love, and these Berean Christians cheerfully listened to him in the Baptist chapel. The fruit of Mr. Wright's labour's among them, after having paid them a few visits, was an entire conviction of the truth of the Unitarian doctrine, and an open avowal of that faith which in their neighbourhood was sadly spoken against ——Towards the close of his life, Mr. Widdowson talked with an enthusiastic ardour of the opinions he then held, and of the superior satisfaction they afforded him above all he had held before. "I have waded," he used to say, "through a deal of mire, but even in that I found a delight, because to my unenlightened mind it bore the semblance of truth; but I have wondered since how I could be so easily satisfied; yet at every stage I met with difficulties which I could not get over, and my joy was always poisoned by the regret that all was not right." Under an Unitarian view of gospel truth he found no doubts unsolved, he saw in the divine Being nothing but love and benignity, in the messenger of his great design the stamp of his image, and in the Christian religion a system of human perfection, the only guide to present satisfaction and to eternal blessedness.—Mr. Widdowson was a striking instance of the power of conscience to bear a man through opposing principles and even a popular clamour. The liberty which he assumed to himself in thinking on religious topics, gave him a like disposition in weighing political opinions; and, the reader will not be surprised to hear that during the last war, he was dubbed a *Jacobin*, and himself and his house threatened to be destroyed because he was the champion of the principles of Thomas Paine, whom the people, with a mayor for a leader, burnt in effigy. Such was the judgment of the rabble, little worthy the serious concern of the conscientious politician. But, regardless of all "their senseless clamours and tumultuous cries," he justified his opinions and came off triumphant. And the writer of these memoirs, who is executor to his will, is astonished to find how many clergymen of the church of England were his friends and steady customers, even to the day of his death: a circumstance that reflects honour on the place in which he lives and the dispositions of these patrons of conscience and of worth. One of them, about that time, was addressed by a friend in these words: "I wonder how you can employ that Widdowson: he is a Jacobin, he is a Culymite *, and holds opinions dangerous to church and state." This enlightened clergyman made the following memorable reply: "He is an honest man, and as long as I find him so, I will never leave his shop." He was always received with the highest respect in the families of the gentry around, and it was not till his infirmities rendered it impossible for him to travel about for their orders that his business began to fall off. But he had the satisfaction of knowing that he had done enough; and seeing his children doing well and being able to leave his widow with a handsome support, he had the best grounds for cheerfulness and hope, which he discovered to the last. He considered not death as an enemy, but often said that as he was of no more use in life it mattered not how soon he went out of it. He died contented and joyful, "with a conscience approving, a bosom serene."

"He rose from life's banquet a satisfied guest,
Thank'd the Lord of the feast, and in hope went to rest."

A very numerous attendance when his funeral sermon was preached, on which occasion the chapel was filled with the most respectable families of tradesmen and others, was a mark of approbation and esteem for the deceased, which also is worthy of being mentioned.

Lincoln. I. W.

* Culymites, from David Culy, a zealous high Calvinist in the beginning of the last century, a sect of methodists; this has been long used in Lincolnshire as a term of reproach for dissenters in general.

Mrs. Paine. — *Rev. John Edwards.* — *Professor Porson.*

On Sunday, July 27, at her brother's house, at Cranbrook, in Kent, in the 68th year of her age, Mrs. PAINE, wife of the celebrated Thomas Paine, author of the "Rights of Man," "Age of Reason," &c. &c. She was the daughter of Mr. Ollive, a respectable tradesman, in Lewes, Sussex, in whose house Mr. Paine lived before his marriage, as well as some time after. The marriage took place at Lewes, in the year 1771; but brought the parties little satisfaction or comfort. After living together three years Mr. and Mrs. Paine, convinced it should seem that they were unsuited to each other, agreed mutually to separate, and accordingly a legal deed of separation was executed. Mrs. Paine's family were Dissenters of the Calvinist persuasion. It may be considered unfortunate for the world that Mr. Paine knew little of Christians, in England but as Calvinists, or in France but as Papists. His attack on Christianity was indeed directed against the gross corruptions of it, as exhibited by these two great Christian parties. Few, or none of his arguments or sneers affect the religion of the New Testament. After her separation from her husband, Mrs. Paine lived amongst her friends, maintaining a respectable and Christian character. Some of her time was passed in London, where she communicated with the Calvinist Baptist church, under Dr. Rippon, meeting in Carter Lane, Tooley Street, Southwark: the rest of it at Cranbrook, where she attended on the ministry of Mr. Stonehouse, of the same denomination.

The death of Mrs. Paine has given occasion for much abuse of her husband. This was needless, ungenerous, and we believe in a great measure *unjustifiable*. Husbands and wives may live uncomfortably together where there is no deism or republicanism to favour dissension. E. D.

Wareham, Sept. 15, 1808.

An awful and alarming dispensation of Providence has lately been presented to us in the sudden death of the Rev. JOHN EDWARDS, well known as the successor of Dr. Priestley in Birmingham, and late lecturer at the Old Jewry.—He has for the last twelve months resided at Crediton, in Devonshire, where he laboured with great success. He left his home about a week before his arrival here, apparently well; but alas! he was then labouring under a disease of the mind, more awful than any malady with which our bodies can be afflicted.

It is supposed that from the fevered state of his head, he found a momentary benefit from the water, as he was seen more than once in the act of bathing; this led to his death. On the morning of Monday the 5th inst. his clothes were discovered on the river's brink about three miles from this place, (near where he was seen bathing the day before,) and on searching the following day, his body was found in the river, near half a mile from the place where his clothes were laid. A coroner's inquest sat on the body, who brought in a verdict "found drowned." He was buried here on Wednesday last. It appeared by memorandums which were found in his pocket book, that he had preached at Exeter, so late as Sunday the 21st. of August, and it has been stated on good authority that he preached the following Sunday (only one week before his melancholy death) to his own congregation at Crediton, from these remarkable words "Take no thought for the morrow!"

On Sunday evening last, Mr Thomas of this place, improved the event in a sermon preached at the Old Meeting house here, from 32nd Job, 8th. verse, "There is a spirit in man; and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." The writer of this forbears attempting to give an outline of this discourse from a conviction that it would be doing Mr. Thomas an injustice. It was one of the most eloquent and impressive he ever heard, and it is hoped that Mr. T. will yield to the wishes of his congregation in presenting it to the world. M.

[We hope to be able to give a further account of this unfortunate gentleman in our next.] Ed.

September 25, at the house of the London Institution, PROFESSOR PORSON, principal librarian. Of this distinguished scholar, we hope to give some account also in our next.

INTELLIGENCE.

MR. STONE.

Our readers are naturally anxious concerning the fate of this gentleman, who, has lately been, to the surprise of all the admirers of the British constitution, prosecuted in the Ecclesiastical Court of the Bishop of London for heresy and blasphemy. We wish we could inform them that Mr. Stone's prosecutors had relented, or that any sufficient authority had interposed to shield him from their vengeance. But though we cannot lay before them any gratifying intelligence, we may possibly, by stating a few facts, excite their generous feelings to an act of charity.

After the sentence of deprivation was pronounced on Mr. Stone, he appealed to the Court of Arches of Canterbury. No decision has yet been obtained. In the mean time, there is a fear that the sentence will be put in execution, so as to deprive him of the income (nearly due) of his living for the last year. Hopes have been held out to him of his receiving as a boon the emoluments of the past year, if he will *resign;* but this he steadily refuses to do, though want stares him in the face, because it would be to acknowledge that Church Authority which he has boldly disavowed!

It is thought that the Bishop of London will deem it prudent to lay Mr. Stone's sentence before his patrons, the Honourable Governors of the Charter House, from which excellent seminary of public education, he was *elected off captain* to College, above half a century ago, in the year 1755. Some of the Governors may perhaps compassionate his case, and dispute the legality of the sentence. This is to be hoped, the rather because there is in the government of the Charter House a noble Duke, who is known to be desirous of a reformation in the church.

Should this step not be taken, or should it be of no advantage to Mr. Stone, it is suggested to us that he might appeal to the Convocation, before which, as it is not allowed to sit for business, the cause would lie undetermined, as long as Mr. Stone should live, he, all the while, retaining his preferment. But the practicability and still more the success of this scheme is very doubtful. What then is Mr. Stone's prospect? Certainly a distressing one, unless the friends of religious liberty, in the church and out of the church, will step forward to save an aged Christian from sinking under the weight of ecclesiastical prosecution. Mr. Stone has a young family dependent on him for support, and no means, worth mentioning, of providing for them, if he loses (as it seems he must lose) his benefice. A few gentlemen, swayed by this affecting consideration, have formed themselves into a committee for receiving subscriptions on behalf of Mr. Stone. It is vain to conceal that their success has not hitherto equalled their hopes. But the public have not till now been put in possession of facts sufficiently plain to interest their compassion. The present appeal to the readers of the *Monthly Repository* will not it is believed be ineffectual. It is proper to acknowledge at the same time that several subscriptions have been brought in and that the committee have promises of more. Subscriptions are received at the banking house of Brown, Cobb and Co. 66, Lombard Street; and also by D. Eaton, Bookseller, 187, High Holborn, and the Editor of the Monthly Repository, at the Printer's.

N. B. Mr. Stone is now employed in drawing up Memoirs of his own Life, respecting principally such events as led to his gradual adoption of Unitarian Christianity, which he is proceeding in, as far as *pecuniary embarrassments* will permit.

QUAKER'S YEARLY EPISTLE, 1808.

Dear Friends,

We are disposed again to pursue the current of Christian good will, which has so often induced us to furnish you with a written memorial of our concern and love for our brethren, dispersed in their various allotments in this kingdom and elsewhere; and thus to fix for your

advantage, some traces of those impressions, which, while reviewing the present state of our Society, have been made on *our* minds. If we are at all instruments in the hand of the Lord to "comfort the feeble-minded" among you, "to support the weak," to encourage the upright, or to arouse the careless; we pray that he, by his almighty influence, may firmly establish in your hearts every good purpose to which our words may excite you; and bless every cup of consolation which he may enable us to hand forth. Thus, dear friends, again we salute you in love—in gospel love. How animating is the ability to consider ourselves the common children of one benevolent and all-powerful Parent, to depend upon him for our own preservation, and to implore him for that of our neighbour! Surely! shall we not thus draw nigh to the accomplishment of those eternal commands, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself?"

The accounts which we have received at this meeting respecting the present state of our religious Society, in the several Quarterly Meetings, continue to affect us with the relation of divers instances of remissness in religious duty, which do not meet with their due share of admonition. Nevertheless we believe that in other cases, the diligence of upright friends, to give counsel where it is obviously necessary, has produced effects which should encourage perseverance. The spirit which tends to scatter and destroy, unless vigilantly withstood, is continually at work; and we request you beloved brethren, to continue vigilant, and not to be satisfied with any former exertions, whilst the lamented evils remain. We call upon you, by that love and compassion which, if you are in your places, you must feel for the negligent, not to slacken in your endeavours to stir them up to diligence. Be persevering and patient. "Stablish your hearts."——This exhortation has been drawn from us by more than a jealousy, that such as are in the frequent neglect of our religious meetings, are suffered too long to remain without counsel. Counsel, we know, may be disregarded; but blessed is he, who, under the holy influence of love, having dispensed it in due season, can feel himself clear of owing any thing to his brother on this account.

Our concern for the preservation of brotherly love remains strong and unabated. When assembled in this meeting we have special cause to know the invigorating, uniting effects of it. Therefore, were there no other inducement, we should still be disposed, from time to time, to renew our earnest and pressing exhortation, that it may abound and flourish amongst our dear brethren in religious profession. Enmity, even in a small degree, pollutes the mind, and renders it unfit to approach with acceptance that pure and holy Being, of whom the beloved disciple thus emphatically testifies, "God is love." Do we not peculiarly lament the wide spread of distress, which the spirit of contention is, even now, occasioning to suffering humanity? This, though it differs in degree, springs from the same root as private ill will. Therefore a people abhorrent of war, if they are consistent, will watch against the smallest bud of enmity, as it is conceived, on any occasion in the heart. And the man who, in the school of Christ, hath learned the useful lesson of self-denial, will often make a sacrifice of his own will and opinion, though he may esteem them to be right, rather than persist in them, at the expense of Christian fellowship.

It is much in the power of those who have the care of young children, to prepare their minds for the salutary restraints of the cross of Christ: and those who thus co-operate with his Holy Spirit, which early visits the tender and flexible mind, may expect (and what better can they seek?) his all-sufficient blessing upon themselves and their offspring. Therefore, ye fathers, and ye mothers, let us entreat you to consider the earliest subjection of the will as the first step in education. It will generally insure to you that desirable ascendency over the minds of your children, which will prevent the need of future severity; it will enable you to govern them by love; and thus you will be rendering your own way more easy, at the same time that you are serving the Lord. And friends, we beseech you, as their understandings ripen, to take due opportunities of opening to them the benefits of the restraints which your duty leads you to impose. Among some of the most irksome to the lively dispositions of

youth, are often those which relate to speech and dress. But as we know that the ground of our dissent from the world in these things, is Christian simplicity; so we know by experience, that they are often the means of defence against temptation to mingle in the company of such as, not being thus subject to holy restraint, are unsuitable examples for our youth to observe and to follow. And when by the gentle intimations of truth in their ripening understandings, they are entered on a course of self-denial, they will feel you doubly dear to them, for having led them on in the way they *should* go, and will bless the Lord on your behalf.

Thus have we again touched upon some of the most important objects of the constant care of this meeting, and indeed of all those who desire to see our Society builded up as a city that is compact together. "Jerusalem" saith the Psalmist, "is builded as a city that is compact together; whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the Lord, unto the testimony of Israel."

We may now turn from subjects which concern every state in life; and direct the course of our Christian counsel to the states, more in particular. And first, you who are not intrusted with much of the possessions of this life, you are still the objects of our constant care. The Society has long endeavoured to consult your interests, and to place within your reach whatever is necessary for your welfare, and for that of your offspring. And you are equally the care of Him who provides for the sparrows; to his ear your access is as easy as that of any condition amongst men; and if, by his holy assistance, and by a conformity to his will, you become truly poor in spirit, yours is the kingdom of heaven. But dear friends, suffer us to remind you, that there is not a passion that can infest the rich, which may not also, in a degree subversive of your peace, be fostered in your minds. You may covet, and give way to pride and anger, and to all the "foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition." Therefore do you partake of the universal necessity of paying strict attention to Christ's sacred injunction, when addressing himself to his immediate followers, he closed his address with these memorable words, "What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch."

As for you dear friends, who occupy what are termed the middle stations of life, you have every cause to bless the Lord for the sphere in which he hath permitted you to move. In you seems fulfilled the wish of Agur: "Give me neither poverty nor riches, (feed me with food convenient for me); lest I be full and deny thee, and say, Who is the Lord? or lest I be poor and steal, and take the name of my God in vain." Among your number the Society has often found many of its more useful members, of its more able advocates. Be content therefore with your stations. Seek not great things for yourselves; yea, "Mind not high things; but condescend to men of low estate." But above all things, "Follow on to know the Lord;" or, if you have not known him and served him, fully and faithfully, seek him "with a perfect heart, and with a willing mind," for "if you seek him, he *will* be found of you;" and you will remain to be, as many of you have been, supports of the building, under the protecting providence of the Lord; who is the sole and true builder of his spiritual house, the "house of prayer for all people."

And you who are intrusted with much of the good things of this life, you who cannot disclaim the title of affluent—we believe there are among you many good stewards of the temporal things committed to your trust; yet we desire that others may duly consider, whether they are so "rich in faith," as to be "heirs of the kingdom," being fruitful in those good works which are produced by faith. Though friends, you may not have to labour with your hands, the cause of truth has business of importance for you to do; and it may be promoted or obstructed by the right or wrong application of your property. Much responsibility lies on you; your property is an additional article in the account; and we much desire that you may be so awake to a sense of these things, as to be prepared to render up your accounts with joy, and to receive the answer of "Well done." The poor and the rich have their appropriate virtues; and, at the same time that each is required to be content and to be humble, we believe it may be truly said, that as contentment is a peculiar ornament of the poor, so is humility of the rich. Your station in life subjects you, more than others, to be tried by

associating with other wealthy persons, among the people at large, with whom the cross of Christ is often in too little esteem. You may be leavened by their conversation and example; and it may operate still more sensibly and rapidly upon your children. Therefore we tenderly entreat you, for your own sake, for that of your offspring whom you are bound to protect, and for the sake of the cause of Truth—we entreat you, dear friends, we beseech you "by the mercies of god," "Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God. For," continues the Apostle, "I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith"

But, how shall we address a state lamentably to be found in every condition of life; and from which few places are wholly free—that state which despises counsel, and places itself almost out of the reach of advice? Dear, but mistaken friends, it is difficult to *speak* to your state, but we *may* pray to the Father of mercies, that *he* would in mercy *plead* with you. And we beseech you, take time to be serious. Be solicitous about your eternal well-being. The restraint of the spirit of truth is the armour that protects the soul; and if you will not be invested with it, you are open to the repeated and increasing assaults of the destroyer; and how will you at length be prepared and found worthy "to stand before the Son of man?"

In this Meeting we have received epistles from our American brethren in most of the States, showing the continuance of their zeal in the cause of righteousness, and encouraging us to perseverance; the particulars of any of which it does not seem needful now to detail. The amount of the sufferings of friends this year, in Great Britain and Ireland, chiefly for tithes, those called church-rates, and military demands, is upwards of eleven thousand seven hundred and seventy pounds*; and two friends have been imprisoned for not having found substitutes in the militia. But we are by no means inclined to complain of the conduct of magistrates; on the contrary, we believe in many places there is a disposition in the hearts of magistrates, which induces them to protect us from suffering to the utmost limit of the law: and we desire that Friends may, on their part, by a meek and peaceable conduct, always insure, and never forfeit their good opinion. In so conducting ourselves, we adorn our profession, and suffer our light to shine.

Now dear friends, of every rank, state and condition, let us endeavour to be one in the Lord: that he may shower down of his mercies, gifts and grace upon all. This will keep each in his proper place. The young will be mild, submissive and teachable; and will become early acquainted with that power which is their only safe conductor through life, and their hope in death. These are near to our hearts. The very remembrance of them awakens our tenderest feeling, and prompts our prayer to the Lord for their preservation. The middle-aged will stand firm in their day, as watchmen upon the wall, and as valiants, having on the armour of light, to withstand the attacks of the enemy. And the aged will have to rejoice both in retrospective, and prospective view. The past will recall to their gladdened remembrance the numberless mercies of the Lord; and the future, through the power of an endless life, and the redeeming virtue of Christ Jesus, our Lord, will open to them the prospect, and satisfy them with the assurance, of being his for ever. Amen. Signed in and on behalf of the Meeting, by

JOHN WILKINSON,
Clerk to the Meeting this Year.

* An opinion being sometimes entertained with regard to these sufferings, that individuals are reimbursed by the Society, it is desired, if occasion should occur, that friends would refute it; as no such practice exists.

METHODIST CONFERENCE.

The sixty-fifth annual conference of the Wesleyan Methodists, was begun at Bristol, on the 25th of July last, James Wood, President, and Thomas Coke, Secretary. By the minutes of this conference, we are informed, as usual, that the Society is still in a prosperous state. Thirty-three preachers were admitted to "FULL CONNEXION," having travelled four years: these of course are allowed to marry. One hundred and thirty-three still remain on trial. Seventy-five new preachers have been admitted on trial. The total number of travelling preachers amounts to upwards of six hundred and seventy. Since the last conference, eleven of the preachers have died. The account of poor Joseph Bradford, of whose death we gave an account in a former number, is comprized in about six lines of the minutes. The manner by which he came by his death is purposely suppressed; and the writer of this article has spoken with several members of the society, none of whom knew any thing of the melancholy end of this worthy and pious preacher!! One preacher has been expelled; whether for immorality or for heresy does not appear; and one has "desisted from travelling;" having "settled in business." Since the conference last met, there have been about 8000 new members added to the Society. The numbers at present, are as follow: West Indies, Nova Scotia, &c. 14,796. Europe, 151,145. United States, 151,590*: making a total of 317,531. The number of chapels "building or to be built in the ensuing year," amount to 129: five of which are to be built in or about London. To accomplish these important objects, it is ordered that sixty-two extra collections are to be made in differents parts of the kingdom. "Brother Owen Davis is allowed the liberty of making a private collection for Holy Head Chapel to the amount of 200£!" A committee is appointed to look out for a suitable situation in Yorkshire for the erection of a school, on a plan similar to that at Kingswood. Several new regulations have been ordered: among which are "*a fund for chapels*;" a new "Religious Tract Society, to be as extensive as the connexion;" and a regulation to prevent too many strangers being admitted to the love feasts.

Unitarian Christians! If there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things! N.

UNITARIAN SOCIETY, SOUTH WALES.

The sixth annual meeting of the Theo-Unitarian Society, in South Wales, was held on Thursday the 7th of July, at Gellionnen, Glamorganshire. The services of the day were introduced with prayer, and the reading of a portion of the scriptures, by Mr. Evan Llwyd of Newton. Then Mr. T. Davis of Coed-y-cymmer, preached on the following exhortation of our blessed Lord "Search the scriptures." He first laid down several canons for reading the scriptures profitably, and then strongly enforced the obligations to faithfulness in the discharge of that important duty. After him, Dr. Estlin delivered in English, a very animating discourse from John xvi. 33. "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." He considered the subject in different lights; but dwelt with peculiar emphasis on it, as predictory of the final complete triumphs of pure and unadulterated Christianity—of the total extinction of sin and misery, and of the universal diffusion of knowledge, virtue and happiness. Next followed a Welch sermon, from Mr. D. Davis of Castle Howel, Cardiganshire, from 1 John iv. 8.—on the love of God,—the greatness and universality of which he demonstrated so clearly, and exemplified with so much true pathos, that there were but few dry eyes in the whole congregation.

After divine worship was concluded, by the last speaker, all strangers were invited to partake (in the meeting-house, as there is no dwelling-house near,) of provisions that had been plentifully provided by individuals belonging to the congregation; then the Society proceeded to transact business. Several new members were added to the list of subscribers; but the yearly subscriptions are not more than equal to the annual expenditures.

* The Conference say, that "the numbers in the United States exceed the above account, but the documents having been mislaid, they cannot be perfectly accurate."

The following resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

1. Resolved that the warm thanks of this Society be given to the Southern Unitarian Society, for their highly valued present of books, and that the secretary be requested to communicate the same.

2. That a like vote of thanks be given to the Rev. B. Evans of Stockton, for a similar donation.

3. That a copy of each sort of the books published by the Society, and also a copy of each sort of books given to it, be bound and presented to the library belonging to the academy at Caermarthen.

4. That the remainder of all books presented to the Society be divided into so many portions as there are receivers of subscriptions*, nominated by the society, in the principality; the quantity of books in every portion, to be in proportion to the number of subscriptions paid, or engaged to be paid to the treasurer, in the current year at the time of dividing them, by each of the receivers respectively,—and that the several portions of books, of which the secretary is requested to keep catalogues, be respectively lodged with the several receivers for the time being, for the benefit of the subscribers, in regular or convenient rotation, and also for the benefit of all to whom any of them may think proper to lend them. The books to be considered as the property, and to be at the disposal of the Society. The secretary is therefore desired to number them and to write on the title-page of each of them, "THIS BOOK BELONGS TO THE THRO-UNITARIAN SOCIETY IN SOUTH WALES."

5. That a parcel, consisting of as many of each of the books published by the Society as can be spared, be sent to our Welch brethren in America

6. That the thanks of the Society be given to Mr. T. Davies, Dr. Estlin, and Mr. D. Davis for their sermons, and likewise to Mr. James for his services in promoting the ends of the Society.

7. That Mr. I. Rowland of Swansea, be appointed Treasurer, &c. to the Society.

8. That Messrs. J. James, D. J. Rees, B. Philips, T. Davis, T. Morgan, D. Oliver, and J. Evans, be appointed committee-men.

9. That the next annual meeting be held at Rhyd-y-Park, Caermarthenshire, on the first Thursday after the 20th of June 1809, and that Mr. D. Davis of Neath, and Mr. D. Oliver of Gellionnen, be appointed to preach.

Divine worship was performed the preceding day. Mr. ———, and Mr. T. Davis, student at the Caermarthen academy, preached, and the latter concluded the services of the day.

On Thursday, several of our Arian brethren in the ministry attended, and a wish, that they would unite with us in propagating those important Christian doctrines which they believe in common with us, was generally expressed. It is sincerely hoped that a difference comparatively so unimportant as that about the period of the creation of our common Lord, will not be a means to prevent an union so desirable.

Neath, 19th Sept. 1808. T. D.

A COMPLETE LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS ON MORALS AND THEOLOGY IN SEPTEMBER, 1808.

Illustrations of the Four Gospels, founded on circumstances peculiar to our Lord and the Evangelists. By John Jones, 8vo. 15s.

The Office of Reason in Religion. By John Clarke, D. D. minister of the first church in Boston, Massachussets, and author of the "Answer to the Question, why are you a Christian?" 12mo. 3d.

An Essay on Future Punishment. By R. Wright, 12mo. 8d.

Proceedings of the General Assembly of the General Baptist Churches, Tuesday, June 7, 1808. *Gratis.*

Memoirs of the Rev. Samuel Bourn, for many years one of the Pastors of the united congregations of the new meeting, in Birmingham and of the meeting, in Coseley, with an appendix. By Joshua Toulmin, D. D. 8vo.

A Father's advice to his Son. A Poem. by the Author of the Widower. 18mo. 1s.

* Most of the receivers of subscriptions are Dissenting ministers.

A Sermon against Witchcraft, preached in the Parish Church of Great Paxton, Huntingdonshire, July 17, 1808. By Isaac Nicholson, A. M. Curate. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

The Simplicity of the Christian Doctrine. A Sermon, preached at Dudley, July 19, 1808, before the Unitarian Tract Society. By John Kentish. 12mo. 1s.

Errors respecting Unitarianism considered; and motives and means for the Dissemination of it stated. A Discourse, delivered at Bristol, June 22, 1808; before the Western Unitarian Tract Society. By Lant Carpenter, L.L.D. 12mo. 1s.

A Sermon preached at the Free Chapel, West Street, St. Giles's, for the benefit of the African and Asiatic Society. By the Rev. W. Gurney, A. B. with an Appendix, containing an Account of the Society. 1s.

The Fall of Babylon: a Sermon. By William Mosely. 1s.

Select Sermons, by Alexander Cleeve, A. B. late Vicar of Wooleston, Northumberland. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Human Laws best supported by the Gospel. A Sermon, preached in the Cathedral church of St. Peter's, York, before the Hon. Sir Soulden Lawrence, Knt. one of the Justices of the Court of King's Bench, March 6, 1808. By F. Wrangham, M.A. F.R.S. 2s. 6d.

Intimations and Evidences of a Future State. By Thomas Watson. 12mo. 4s.

Reflections on sundry Passages of Scripture. By a Lady, 4s.

The Second Report of the Committee of the African Institution, read at the Annual Meeting, on the 25th of March, 1808; to which is added a List of Subscribers. 1s.

An Essay on the Spirit of Christianity; containing some new Observations calculated to explain and simplify the subject, and reconcile differences, &c. By Wm. Burns. 12mo.

Animadversions on the Rev. Wm. Parry's "Strictures on the Origin of Moral Evil; in which the Hypothesis of the Rev. Dr. Williams is investigated." with an Appendix, containing Strictures on the Rev. Wm. Bennet's Remarks on the same subject. By Thomas Hill. 8vo. 3s.

Thoughts on the primary condition of Intelligent Accountable Creatures. By W. Bennet. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

The Legislature alarmed and the Barrister unmasked! Occasioned by Hints to the Public and the Legislature, on the Nature and Effects of Evangelical Preaching. By a Barrister. By Vigil. 8vo. 1s.

A Vindication of the Nature and Effect of Evangelical Preaching. In a Letter addressed to a Barrister, occasioned by the First Part of his Hints to the Public and the Legislature; with a Postscript containing Strictures on his Second Part. By John Styles.

Dr. Hawker's Second Letter to a Barrister, occasioned by the Second Part of his Hints to the Public and the Legislature.

Letter to a Noble Duke on the Evidences of Christianity, 8vo. 3s.

Christ's Supremacy and his Church's Privileges defended. By a Christian. 8vo. 1s.

The History of the Christian Church, from the Birth of Christ to the present time. By Joseph Sabine. 12mo. 5s. 8vo. 9s.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Our Correspondent, Mr. J——s, mistakes our meaning. We wish not to *retain* inadmissible communications—we are ready to leave them for their owners at the Printer's—we only cannot engage to return them by coach, or waggon, or post, or private hand.———The *Glasgow Baptist* has given us great pleasure by his communication, but he will not wonder that we judge it to be too incorrect, and immethodical for insertion.———W. M. P.'s paper contains some good thoughts; but as a whole it wants point.———We have received several sensible and ingenious replies to the "Churchman;" but we cannot afford room for any further answers than those in our last number. If the "Churchman" means to take any notice of them, we wish him to do it as early as convenient. The controversy must not run into our next volume.———In our next will appear Dr. Franklin's notes on the opening of Essex Street Chapel, communicated by Mr. Whatley;—Hylas, of Chichester, "Of Right considered as founded on Power;—Primitivus, of Palgrave; Chariclo of Diss; and Mr. Howe, of Bridport, "on the Judgment of the World by Jesus Christ."—Various communications are under consideration.